

Sunshine Act Meetings

Federal Register

Vol. 51, No. 111

Tuesday, June 10, 1986

This section of the FEDERAL REGISTER contains notices of meetings published under the "Government in the Sunshine Act" (Pub. L. 94-409) 5 U.S.C. 552b(e)(3).

CONTENTS

| | Item |
|---|------|
| Commission on Civil Rights..... | 1 |
| Federal Communications Commission.. | 2 |
| Federal Labor Relations Authority..... | 3 |
| Neighborhood Reinvestment Corpora- tion..... | 4 |

1

COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

PLACE: 1121 Vermont Avenue, NW., Washington, DC, Room 512.

DATE AND TIME: Thursday, June 12, 1986, 9:00 a.m.—5:00 p.m.

STATUS OF MEETING: Open to the public.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:

- I. Approval of Agenda.
- II. Approval of Minutes of Last Meeting.
- III. Staff Director's Report for May:
 - A. Status of Funds,
 - B. Personnel Report,
 - C. Office Directors' Reports.
- IV. Recent Activity Against Citizens and Residents of Asian Descent.
- V. The Economic Status of Euroethnic Americans.
- VI. Delaware SAC Report—Report of a November 1984 Conference.
- VII. Civil Rights Developments in the Mid-Atlantic Region.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION PLEASE

CONTACT: Barbara Brooks, Press and Communications Division (202) 376-8314.

William H. Gillers,
Solicitor.

June 6, 1986.

[FR Doc. 86-13111 Filed 6-6-86; 10:28 am]

BILLING CODE 6335-01-M

2

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Additional Item To Be Considered at Open Meeting, Thursday, June 5th

June 4, 1986.

The Federal Communications Commission will consider an additional item on the subject listed below at the Open Meeting scheduled for 9:30 a.m., Thursday, June 5, 1986, in Room 856, at 1919 M Street, NW., Washington, DC.

Agenda, Item No., and Subject

Mass Media—2—Title: Amended request for a special temporary authorization to be issued to a trustee, filed by Macfadden Acquisition Corp. as a first step in its attempt to acquire control of John Blair & Company, a Commission licensee.
Summary: The Commission will consider an amended request for a special temporary authorization filed by Macfadden Acquisition Corp., and opposing pleadings filed by John Blair & Company and others.

The prompt and orderly conduct of Commission business requires that less than 7-days notice be given consideration of this additional item.

Action by the Commission June 4, 1986. Commissioners Fowler, Chairman; Quello, Dawson and Patrick voting to consider this additional item.

Additional information concerning this meeting may be obtained from Judith Kurtich, FCC Office of Congressional and Public Affairs, telephone number (202) 254-7674.

Federal Communications Commission.

William J. Tricarico,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 86-13142 Filed 6-6-86; 12:34 pm]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-M

3

FEDERAL LABOR RELATIONS AUTHORITY

TIMES AND DATES: Tuesday, June 24, 1986, 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.; Thursday, June 26, 1986, 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

PLACE: 500 C Street, SW., Washington, DC, Room 229.

STATUS OF MEETING: Open to the public.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED: In conjunction with a review of changes in case-processing procedures suggested by various Federal agencies, labor organizations representing Federal employees, and individuals, the Federal Labor Relations Authority is requesting oral and/or written comments concerning issues involved in four major regulatory revisions it is considering. The revisions and the issues on which the FLRA is seeking comments are as follows:

Revision 1: Delegation of the FLRA's authority to decide unfair labor practice cases to its Administrative Law Judges.

Issues: (1) Should the FLRA exercise its power under section 7105(d), (e), and (f) of the Federal Service Labor-Management Relations Statute, 5 U.S.C. 7105, to delegate its decisionmaking

authority in unfair labor practice (ULP) cases to its Administrative Law Judges (ALJ's)?

(2) What should the effective date of such a delegation be? Should the delegation apply to (a) charges filed, (b) complaints issued, or (c) decisions of ALJ's issued on and after the effective date?

(3) Should the delegation extend to all issues which may be litigated and decided in a ULP proceeding? Should some issues be reviewable by the Authority in all instances where timely review is sought by a party? If so, what issues?

(4) Should the FLRA's Rules and Regulations be amended to preclude the transfer of ULP cases directly to the FLRA based upon a stipulated record where no material issue of fact exists?

(5) What criteria should be applied to determine whether the ALJ's decision should be accepted for review? Should the FLRA use the same criteria it uses in determining whether to grant an application for review of representation case decisions issued by Regional Directors?

(6) What should be the precedential significance, if any, attached to an ALJ decision when (a) no timely application for review was filed, or (b) a timely application for review was filed only as to certain of the ALJ's findings and conclusions?

Revision 2: Providing discovery in unfair labor practice proceedings.

Issues: (1) The FLRA's Rules and Regulations, 5 CFR 2423.19, now authorize the ALJ presiding at a hearing to (a) grant requests for subpoenas, (b) order the taking of depositions, (c) order responses to written interrogatories, and (d) take any other action deemed necessary and not prohibited by the regulations. Should discovery be permitted in ULP proceedings prior to the opening of a hearing before an ALJ? If so, to what extent should the parties be subject to discovery?

(2) If discovery is permitted prior to a hearing, at what stage would it be permitted?

(3) If discovery is permitted prior to a hearing, what should be the safeguards to protect the identity of individuals who provide statements and information during the investigation of charges in order to assure the FLRA's ability to obtain relevant information?

(4) How should the cooperation of all parties in the discovery process be assured? What sanctions or enforcement mechanisms should be used?

Revision 3: Requiring Federal agencies to include in their written assertions of nonnegotiability the specific reasons for making such assertions, including relevant citations, and labor organizations to include in their petitions for review of negotiability issues their specific arguments for the negotiability of the proposals in dispute, including relevant citations.

Issues: (1) Should the FLRA require Federal agencies to include in their written assertions of nonnegotiability the specific reasons for making the assertions, including relevant citations? Should the FLRA require labor organizations to include in their petitions for review of negotiability issues their specific arguments for the negotiability of the proposals in dispute, including relevant citations?

(2) Would these requirements be unduly burdensome on agency and union representatives? Are there alternative ways to promote bilateral discussions at the local level concerning the negotiability of collective bargaining proposals? If so, what are the alternatives?

Revision 4: Establishing a pilot program providing written negotiability determinations by FLRA staff members which are appealable to the FLRA Members.

Issues: (1) Should the FLRA establish a pilot program to provide parties with written negotiability determinations by FLRA staff members which are appealable to the FLRA Members? Would this alternative approach to negotiability decisionmaking promote the resolution of negotiability disputes?

(2) If such a pilot program is established, what criteria should be used to select the cases in which the staff determinations are provided?

(3) What time limits should be provided for appeal of a written negotiability determination by a staff member?

(4) What should be the precedential significance, if any, of a written negotiability determination by a staff member where (a) no timely appeal of the determination is filed, or (b) a timely appeal of the determination is filed only as to certain proposals?

Any person desiring to speak at these meetings should notify Harold D. Kessler, Director of Case Management, FLRA, 500 C Street, SW., Washington, DC 20424, in writing. Notifications must be received by the FLRA by June 16, 1986, and should state (1) whether the person is representing an agency or labor organization and if so, which agency or organization; (2) the issues which will be addressed and the length of time requested for the oral presentation; and (3) the address and telephone number of the person desiring to speak at the meeting. Persons requesting opportunities to speak at the meetings will be contacted to schedule their participation.

Written comments concerning the issues may be submitted in addition to or in lieu of an oral presentation. Two copies of written comments should be submitted to Harold D. Kessler, Director of Case Management, FLRA, 500 C Street, SW., Washington, DC 20424, and must be received by the FLRA by July 11, 1986.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION PLEASE

CONTACT: Harold D. Kessler, (202) 382-0715.

Dated: June 5, 1986.

Jerry L. Calhoun,
Chairman.

Henry B. Frazier III,
Member.

John C. Miller,
General Counsel.

FR Doc. 86-13080 Filed 6-6-86; 9:18 am]

BILLING CODE 6727-01-M

4

NEIGHBORHOOD REINVESTMENT CORPORATION

TIME AND DATE: 2:30 p.m. Friday, June 6, 1986.

PLACE: Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond, 701 East Byrd Street, Richmond, VA 23261.

STATUS: Open.

CONTACT PERSON FOR MORE

INFORMATION: Timothy McCarty,
Director of Communications, 376-2623.

AGENDA:

I. Call to order and remarks of the Vice Chairman.

II. Approval of Minutes, March 17, 1986.

III. Executive Director's Activity Report.

IV. Election of Officers and Appointment of Assistant Secretary.

V. Approval of Board Committee Appointments:

A. Audit Committee,

B. Budget Committee,

C. Personnel Committee.

VI. Budget Committee Report.

VII. Treasurer's Report.

Carol J. McCabe

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 86-13061 Filed 6-5-86; 4:07 pm]

BILLING CODE 7570-01-M

Environmental Protection Agency

Tuesday
June 10, 1986

Part II

**Environmental
Protection Agency**

40 CFR Part 300

**Amendment to National Oil and
Hazardous Substances Contingency Plan;
National Priorities List; Final Rule and
Proposed Rules**

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 300

[SW-FRL-2973-2]

Amendment to National Oil and Hazardous Substances Contingency Plan; National Priorities List

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA") is amending the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Contingency Plan ("NCP"), which was promulgated on July 16, 1982, pursuant to section 105 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 ("CERCLA") and Executive Order 12316. CERCLA requires that the NCP include a list of national priorities among the known releases or threatened releases of hazardous substances, pollutants, and contaminants throughout the United States, and that the list be revised at least annually. The National Priorities List ("NPL"), initially promulgated as Appendix B of the NCP on September 8, 1983, constitutes this list and is being revised today by the addition of 170 sites to the final NPL. EPA has reviewed public comments on the listing of these sites and has decided that they meet the eligibility requirements of the NPL.

EFFECTIVE DATE: The effective date for this amendment to the NCP shall be July 10, 1986. CERCLA section 305 provides for a legislative veto of regulations promulgated under CERCLA. Although *INS v. Chadha*, 462 U.S. 919, 103 S. Ct. 2764 (1983), cast the validity of the legislative veto into question, EPA has transmitted a copy of this regulation to the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representative. If any action by Congress calls the effective date of this regulation into question, the Agency will publish a notice of clarification in the **Federal Register**.

ADDRESSES: Addresses for the Headquarters and Regional dockets follow. For further details on what these dockets contain, see the Introduction to the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section of this preamble.

Denise Sines, Headquarters, U.S. EPA CERCLA Docket Office, Waterside Mall Subbasement, 401 M Street, SW., Washington, DC 20460, 202/382-3046.

Peg Nelson, Region 1, U.S. EPA Library, Room E121, John F. Kennedy Federal Bldg., Boston, MA 02203, 617/223-5791

Carole Peterson, Region 2, Site Investigation & Compliance Branch, 26 Federal Plaza, 7th Floor, Room 737, New York, NY 10278, 212/264-8677.

Diane McCreary, Region 3, U.S. EPA Library, 5th Floor, 841 Chestnut Bldg., 9th & Chestnut Streets, Philadelphia, PA 19107, 215/579-0580.

Gayle Alston, Region 4, U.S. EPA Library, Room G-6, 345 Courtland Street, N.E., Atlanta, GA 30365, 404/347-4216.

Lou Tilley, Region 5, U.S. EPA Library, 16th Floor, 230 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, IL 60604, 312/353-2022.

Barry Nash, Region 6, InterFirst II Bldg., 1201 Elm Street, Dallas, TX 75270, 214/767-4075.

Connie McKenzie, Region 7, U.S. EPA Library, 726 Minnesota Avenue, Kansas City, KS 66101, 913/236-2828.

Dolores Eddy, Region 8, U.S. EPA Library, 999 18th Street, Suite 1300, Denver, CO 80202-2413, 303/293-1444.

Jean Circiello, Region 9, U.S. EPA Library, 6th Floor, 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, CA 94105, 415/974-8076.

Joan Shafer, Region 10, U.S. EPA, 11th Floor, 1200 6th Avenue, Mail Stop 525, Seattle, WA 98101 206/442-4903.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jane Metcalfe, Hazardous Site Control Division, Office of Emergency and Remedial Response (WH-548E), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street, SW., Washington, DC 20460, Phone (800) 424-9346 (or 382-3000 in the Washington, DC, metropolitan area).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Table of Contents

- I. Introduction
- II. Purpose and Implementation of the NPL
- III. Process for Establishing and Updating the NPL
- IV. Eligibility
- V. Generic HRS Issues
- VI. Disposition of Proposed Sites
- VII. Deletion of Final Sites
- VIII. Contents of the NPL
- IX. Regulatory Impact Analysis
- X. Regulatory Flexibility Act Analysis

I. Introduction

Pursuant to section 105 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, 42 U.S.C. 9601-9657 ("CERCLA" or the "Act"), and Executive Order 12316 (46 FR 42237, August 20, 1981), the Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA" or "the Agency") promulgated the revised National Contingency Plan ("NCP"), 40 CFR Part 300, on July 16, 1982 (47 FR 31180) and amendments to the NCP on September 16, 1985 (50 FR 37624) and November 20, 1985 (50 FR 47912). The NCP and its amendments implement responsibilities

and authorities created by CERCLA to respond to releases and threatened releases of hazardous substances, pollutants, and contaminants.

Section 105(8)(A) of CERCLA requires that the NCP include criteria for determining priorities among releases or threatened releases throughout the United States for the purposes of taking remedial action and, to the extent practicable, take into account the potential urgency of such action for the purpose of taking removal action. Removal action involves cleanup or other actions that are taken in response to releases or threats of releases on a short-term or temporary basis (CERCLA section 101(23)). Remedial action tends to be long-term in nature and involves response actions which are consistent with a permanent remedy for a release (CERCLA section 101(24)). Criteria for determining priorities for possible remedial actions financed by the Hazardous Response Trust Fund established under CERCLA are included in the Hazard Ranking System ("HRS"), which EPA promulgated as Appendix A of the NCP (47 FR 31219, July 16, 1982).

Section 105(8)(B) of CERCLA requires that these criteria be used to prepare a list of national priorities among the known releases or threatened releases of hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants throughout the United States, and that to the extent practicable, at least 400 sites be designated on this National Priorities List (NPL). An original NPL of 406 sites was promulgated on September 8, 1983 (48 FR 40658). The NPL has been expanded since then (see 49 FR 19480, May 8, 1984; 49 FR 37070, September 21, 1984; 50 FR 6320, February 14, 1985; and 50 FR 37630, September 16, 1985). On March 7, 1986 (51 FR 7935), EPA published a notice to delete eight sites from the NPL (see section VII of this preamble). Earlier, the Agency had proposed to add another 309 sites to the NPL (see 49 FR 40320, October 15, 1984; 50 FR 14115, April 10, 1985; and 50 FR 37950, September 18, 1985). The proposed update #5 rulemaking announced elsewhere in today's **Federal Register** adds 45 proposed sites to the NPL. In a second notice in today's **Federal Register**, the Agency is soliciting additional comments on 5 previously proposed sites (50 FR 6320). Today's rule adds 170 of the remaining proposed sites to the NPL, including 20 from the two 1985 proposals—Update #3 and Update #4—on which no comments were received. This brings the number of final sites on the NPL to 703, with an additional 185 (including 47 Federal

facilities) in the proposed category, for a total of 888 final and proposed sites.

Following the October 15, 1984, proposal, EPA carefully considered public comments submitted during the comment period and made some modifications in this final rule in response to those comments. Responses to major NPL policy comments are addressed in this preamble, as are generic HRS scoring comments. Responses to site-specific HRS comments are presented in the "Support Document for the Revised National Priorities List—1986," which is a separate document available in the EPA dockets in Washington, D.C., and the Regional Offices (see **ADDRESSES**).

Public Docket Information

The Headquarters public docket for the NPL will contain Hazard Ranking System (HRS) score sheets for each final site, a Documentation Record for each site describing the information used to compute the scores, a list of document references and the "Support Document for the National Priorities List—1986." The Headquarters public docket is available for viewing by appointment only from 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m., Monday through Friday excluding holidays. Requests for copies of the documents from the Headquarters public docket should be directed to the EPA Headquarters docket office. The HRS score sheets and the Documentation Record for each site in a particular EPA Region will be available for viewing in that Regional Office when this notice is published. The Regional dockets will also contain documents referenced in the Documentation Record which contain the background data EPA relied upon in calculating or evaluating the HRS scores and a copy of the "Support Document for the Revised National Priorities List—1986." Copies of these background documents may be viewed in the appropriate Regional Office and copies may be obtained from each Regional docket. Documents with some relevance to the scoring of each site, but which were not used as references, may also be viewed and copied by arrangements with the appropriate EPA Regional Office. Requests for HRS score sheets, Documentation Records, background documents and copies of the Support Document should be directed to either Headquarters or the appropriate Regional Office docket (see **Addresses** section). An informal written request, rather than a formal request, should be the ordinary procedure for obtaining copies of these comments.

Organization of the Preamble

Section II of this preamble discusses the purpose and implementation of the NPL. The process EPA uses for the development of this rulemaking, and of the NPL in general, is discussed in Section III. NPL eligibility policies and eligibility issues raised by commenters are addressed in Section IV of this preamble. Section V addresses generic HRS issues, while Section VI summarizes score changes and discusses and disposition of the previously proposed sites. Deletion of sites from the NPL is discussed in Section VII. Section VIII provides information on the contents of the final rulemaking. Finally, EPA's regulatory impact analysis and Regulatory Flexibility Act analysis are discussed in Sections IX and X, respectively.

II. Purpose and Implementation of the NPL

Purpose

The primary purpose of the NPL is stated in the legislative history of CERCLA (Report of the Committee on Environment and Public Works, Senate Report No. 96-848, 96th Cong., 2d. Sess. 60 (1980)):

The NPL serves primarily informational purposes, identifying for the States and the public those facilities and sites or other releases which appear to warrant remedial actions. Inclusion of a facility or site on the list does not in itself reflect a judgment of the activities of its owner or operator, it does not require those persons to undertake any action, nor does it assign liability to any person. Subsequent government action in the form of remedial actions or enforcement actions will be necessary in order to do so, and these actions will be attended by all appropriate procedural safeguards.

The purpose of the NPL, therefore, is primarily to serve as an informational tool for use by EPA in identifying sites that appear to present a significant risk to public health or the environment. The initial identification of a site for the NPL is intended primarily to guide EPA in determining which sites warrant further investigation, to assess the nature and extent of the public health and environmental risks associated with the site, and to determine what CERCLA-financed remedial action(s), if any, may be appropriate. Inclusion of a site on the NPL does not establish that EPA necessarily will undertake response actions. Moreover, listing does not require any action of any private party, nor does it determine the liability of any party for the cost of cleanup at the site. A site need not be on the NPL to be the subject of CERCLA-financed removal actions, actions brought pursuant to

section 106 or 107(a)(4)(b) of CERCLA, or remedial investigations/feasibility studies.

Implementation

EPA's policy is to pursue cleanup of hazardous waste sites using the appropriate response and/or enforcement actions which are available to the Agency, including authorities other than CERCLA. Publication of sites on the NPL will serve as notice to any potentially responsible party that the Agency may initiate Fund-financed response action. The Agency will decide on a site-by-site basis whether to take enforcement or other action under CERCLA or other authorities, or whether to proceed directly with Fund-financed CERCLA response actions and seek recovery of response costs after cleanup. To the extent feasible, once sites are listed on the NPL, EPA will determine high-priority candidates for either Fund-financed response action or enforcement action through both State and Federal initiative. These determinations will take into account which approach is more likely to most expeditiously accomplish cleanup of the site while using the Fund's limited resources as efficiently as possible.

Funding of response actions for sites will not necessarily take place in the same order as the sites' ranking on the NPL. In addition, although the HRS scores used to place sites on the NPL may be helpful to the Agency in determining priorities for cleanup and other response activities among sites on the NPL, EPA does not rely on the scores as the sole means of determining such priorities. The information collected to develop HRS scores is not sufficient in itself to determine the appropriate remedy for a particular site. EPA relies on further, more detailed studies to determine what response, if any, is appropriate.

These studies will take into account the extent and magnitude of contaminants in the environment, the risk to affected populations and environment, the cost to correct problems at the site, and the response actions that have been taken by potentially responsible parties or others. Decisions on the type and extent of action to be taken at these sites are made in accordance with the criteria contained in Subpart F of the NCP. After conducting these additional studies, EPA may conclude that it is not desirable to conduct an Agency response action at some sites on the NPL because of more pressing needs at other sites, or because an enforcement action may instigate or force private

party cleanup. Given the limited resources available in the Trust Fund, the Agency must carefully balance the relative needs for response at the numerous sites it has studied. It is also possible that EPA will conclude after further analysis that the site does not warrant response action.

Revisions to the NPL such as today's rulemaking may move some previously listed sites to a lower position on the NPL. If EPA has initiated action such as a remedial investigation or feasibility study (RI/FS) at a site, the Agency does not intend to cease such actions in order to determine if a subsequently listed site should have a higher priority for funding. Rather, the Agency will continue funding site studies and remedial actions once they have been initiated, regardless of whether higher-scoring sites are later added to the NPL.

The NPL does not determine priorities for removal actions; EPA may take removal actions at any site, whether listed or not, that meets the criteria of §§ 300.65-300.67 of the NCP. Likewise, EPA may take enforcement actions under applicable statutes against responsible parties regardless of whether the site is listed on the NPL, although, as a practical matter, the focus of EPA's enforcement actions has been and will continue to be on NPL sites.

A site cannot undergo Fund-financed remedial action until it is placed on the final NPL. However, an RI/FS can be performed at proposed sites pursuant to the Agency's removal authority under CERCLA, as outlined in § 300.68(a)(1) of the NCP. Section 101(23) of CERCLA defines "remove" or "removal" to include "such actions as may be necessary to monitor, assess and evaluate the release or threat of release . . ." The definition of "removal" also includes "action taken under Section 104(b) of this Act . . ." Section 104(b) authorizes the Agency to perform studies, investigations, and other information-gathering activities.

The Agency may elect to conduct an RI/FS at a proposed NPL site in preparation for a possible Fund-financed remedial action in a number of circumstances, such as when the Agency believes that delay in commencing the studies may create unnecessary risks to human health or the environment. In making such a decision, the Agency assumes the risk that after consideration of public comments and the consistent application of the HRS, it is possible that the proposed site might not qualify for the NPL. In assuming this risk, the Agency has determined that the desirability of expediting remedial action through the initiation of the

investigation stage prior to placing a site on the NPL outweighs the risk of expending a limited amount of Fund monies for the RI/FS.

III. Process for Establishing and Updating the NPL

There are three mechanisms for placing sites on the NPL. The principal mechanism is the application of the HRS. Those sites that score 28.50 or greater on the HRS are eligible for listing. In addition, States may designate a single site as the State top priority. EPA may also place sites on the NPL pursuant to § 300.66(b)(4) of the NCP.

States have the primary responsibility for identifying sites, computing HRS scores, and submitting candidate sites to the EPA Regional Offices. EPA Regional Offices conduct a quality control review of the States' candidate sites, and may assist in investigating, sampling, monitoring, and scoring sites. Regional Offices may consider candidate sites in addition to those submitted by States. EPA Headquarters conducts further quality assurance audits to ensure accuracy and consistency among the various EPA and State offices participating in the scoring. The Agency then proposes the new sites that meet the criteria for listing and solicits public comment on the proposal. Based on these comments and further review by EPA, the Agency determines final scores and promulgates those sites that still qualify for listing.

On October 15, 1984, EPA proposed NPL Update #2 (49 FR 40320). All of the 244 proposed sites received HRS scores of 28.50 or higher. The cut-off score of 28.50 was the same cut-off score chosen for the previous NPL rulemakings.

The public comment period on the October 15, 1984, proposed rule ended December 14, 1984. To the extent practicable, EPA considered late comments received after the close of the formal comment period. EPA evaluated all comments received by May 7, 1986. Based on the comments received on the proposed rule, as well as further investigation by EPA and the States, EPA recalculated the HRS scores for individual sites where appropriate. EPA's response to site-specific public comments and explanations of any score changes made as a result of such comments are addressed in the "Support Document for the Revised National Priorities List—1986." This document is available for review in the EPA dockets in Washington, D.C., and the Regional Offices (see Addresses). EPA's response to comments on NPL eligibility issues is included in Section IV of this preamble, while comments on generic HRS issues are discussed in Section V.

IV. Eligibility

CERCLA restricts EPA's authority to respond to certain categories of releases by expressly excluding some substances from the definition of "release". In addition, as a matter of policy, EPA may choose not to use CERCLA to respond to certain types of releases because other authorities can be used to achieve cleanup of these releases. Where such other authorities exist, and the Federal government can undertake or enforce cleanup pursuant to a particular established program, listing on the NPL to determine the priority or need for response under CERCLA may not be appropriate. Therefore, EPA has chosen not to consider certain types of sites for the NPL even though CERCLA may provide authority to respond. If, however, the Agency later determines that sites not listed as a matter of policy are not being properly responded to, the Agency may consider placing them on the NPL.

NPL eligibility policies of particular relevance to this final rule are discussed below and cover Federal facility sites, Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) sites, mining waste sites, pesticide-application sites, and radioactive material sites.

Releases From Federal Facilities

CERCLA Section 111(e)(3) prohibits use of the Trust Fund for remedial actions at Federally-owned facilities. However, pursuant to § 300.66(e)(2) of the NCP, amended on November 20, 1985 (50 FR 47912), the Agency can place Federal facilities on the NPL.

Prior to the proposal of NPL Update #2, EPA did not list any sites on the NPL where the release resulted solely from a Federal facility, regardless of whether contamination remained on-site or had migrated off-site. However, based on public comments received from previous NPL announcements, EPA proposed 36 Federal facilities for NPL Update #2 and solicited comments on the listing of Federal facilities on the NPL. All general comments received in response to that solicitation are addressed in the preamble to the Federal Register notice for the promulgation of the NCP amendments and the "Response to Comments Document—October 10, 1985" that accompanied that rulemaking. This document is available in the Headquarters public docket.

In a future rulemaking, EPA will add Federal facility sites to a separate section of the NPL and will provide the response categories and cleanup status codes for those sites. The same technical criteria that qualify non-

Federal sites for the NPL will be used to qualify Federal sites.

EPA has not completed its review of the public comments received on the 36 Federal facility sites proposed for this NPL update and, therefore is deferring rulemaking on these sites at this time.

Releases From Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Sites

A. Background

Since the first NPL final rule (48 FR 40658, September 8, 1983), it has been the Agency's policy to defer placing sites on the NPL that can be addressed by RCRA Subtitle C corrective action authorities. Prior to enactment of the Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments of 1984 (HSWA), only releases to ground water from surface impoundments, waste piles, land treatment areas, and landfills that received RCRA hazardous wastes after July 26, 1982, and did not certify closure prior to January 26, 1983, (the effective date of the RCRA regulations for permitting land disposal facilities) were subject to corrective action requirements under Subtitle C. Therefore, these units were not eligible for listing unless they were abandoned, lacked sufficient resources or RCRA corrective action requirements could not be enforced.

The enactment of HSWA greatly expanded RCRA Subtitle C corrective action authorities. For example, under section 3004(u), hazardous waste treatment, storage and disposal facilities seeking RCRA permits must address all releases of hazardous constituents to any medium from solid waste management units, whether active or inactive. HSWA also provided new authority in Section 3004(v) to address releases that have migrated beyond the facility boundary if the permission of the owner of the affected property can be obtained. In addition, section 3008(h) authorizes EPA to compel corrective action or any response necessary to protect human health or the environment when there is or has been a release of hazardous waste at a RCRA interim status facility.

In light of the new authorities, the Agency proposed in the preamble to the April 10, 1985, proposed rule (50 FR 14118), a revised policy for listing of RCRA-related sites on the NPL. Under the proposed policy, listing on the NPL of RCRA-related sites would be deferred until the Agency determined that RCRA corrective measures were not likely to succeed due to factors such as: (1) The inability or unwillingness of the owner/operator to pay for such activities; (2) the inadequacies of the financial

responsibility guarantees to pay for such costs; and (3) EPA or State priorities for addressing the sites under RCRA. In addition, the Agency indicated that it intended to apply the RCRA listing policy to RCRA sites that were currently proposed or promulgated on the NPL and, in appropriate cases, delete sites from the NPL.

The Agency has evaluated the comments received on the proposed RCRA listing policy. Today, EPA is deciding and implementing major components of the final RCRA listing policy. Elsewhere in today's *Federal Register*, the Agency is proposing and requesting comments on additional components of the policy. A discussion of the policy follows.

B. Components of the Final RCRA Listing Policy

The final Agency policy is generally consistent with the proposal and with the Agency's previous RCRA listing policy. Sites not subject to RCRA Subtitle C requirements will remain eligible for the NPL. Examples include facilities that ceased treating, storing or disposing of hazardous wastes prior to November 19, 1980 (the effective date of Phase I of the RCRA regulations) and sites at which only materials exempted from the statutory or regulatory definition of solid waste or hazardous waste are managed. RCRA hazardous waste handlers to which Subtitle C corrective action authorities do not apply, such as hazardous waste generators or transporters not required to have interim status or a final RCRA permit, also remain eligible for the NPL. In most situations, listing of sites with releases that can be addressed under the RCRA Subtitle C corrective action authorities will be deferred.

Although sites that can be addressed by RCRA Subtitle C corrective action authorities generally will not be placed on the NPL, the Agency believes that certain sites subject to Subtitle C corrective action requirements should be listed if they meet all of the other criteria for listing (e.g., an HRS score of 28.5 or greater).

As noted in the preamble to proposed NPL Update #3 (50 FR 14110, April 10, 1985), the Agency is concerned about owners or operators who are unwilling or unable to pay for corrective action and related activities. If an owner or operator appears to lack the financial resources to undertake necessary responses, it may be appropriate to use CERCLA authorities to protect human health or the environment. It may also be appropriate to use CERCLA authorities to address facilities at which necessary corrective actions under

RCRA are unlikely to be performed. The Agency has identified three categories of facilities that meet these criteria: (1) Facilities owned by persons who are bankrupt; (2) facilities that have lost RCRA interim status and for which there are additional indications that the owner or operator will be unwilling to undertake corrective action; and (3) sites, analyzed on a case-by-case basis, whose owners or operators have shown an unwillingness to undertake corrective action. Reasons for including sites on the NPL which fall into these categories are discussed below.

1. *Bankruptcy.* Once an entity is in bankruptcy, the entity's assets are protected by the courts. In such situations, the Agency does not have adequate assurance that funds will be available in a timely manner for response actions. Therefore, RCRA facilities that are bankrupt will be eligible for listing.

2. *Loss of authorization to operate/probable unwillingness to carry out corrective action.* RCRA Interim Status facilities lose authorization to operate when interim status is terminated (1) under RCRA section 3008(h), (2) by permit denial under RCRA section 3005(c), or (3) by operation of RCRA section 3005(e). For example, interim status is terminated under section 3005(e) when an owner or operator cannot or will not certify compliance with applicable ground water monitoring and financial responsibility requirements and submit a permit application. Permits are denied under section 3005(c) if the owner or operator has failed to submit an acceptable Part B permit application. It is likely that many of these interim status facilities that have lost authorization to operate may not be willing to carry out corrective action; facilities where this is the case may be placed on the NPL. In determining whether an owner/operator is not likely to be willing to carry out corrective action, the Agency will consider the compliance history of the facility, including particularly the existence of multiple or significant violations and the numbers and types of final enforcement actions taken against the facility.

3. *Case-by-case determinations of unwillingness.* When EPA proposed to revise its policy with respect to listing RCRA sites on the NPL, the Agency explained that proposed or final sites at which remedial investigations/feasibility studies had been initiated might not be removed from the NPL. The Agency recognized that it might be disruptive to abandon CERCLA activities in some or all of these

situations. Several sites are being added to the NPL based upon that aspect of the proposed policy.

At two sites that were included in proposed NPL Update #2, Fund-financed remedial planning is now in progress. These sites were proposed before the enactment of HSWA and met all of the NPL eligibility requirements at the time they were proposed, including the RCRA listing policy then in effect. The expanded RCRA Subtitle C corrective action authorities established by HSWA did not apply at the time of the proposals; thus, CERCLA appeared to be the only authority that could effectuate remedial action if it were necessary. Based on the conditions at those two sites, EPA found it appropriate to begin the remedial planning process. The owners or operators of these sites were offered the opportunity to undertake the remedial planning activities themselves but did not agree to do so. At one site, the owner/operator also declined to pay for other response activities that EPA advised the owner/operator were appropriate to mitigate threats to public health and the environment.

The Agency's final and proposed RCRA listing policy announced today is based in part on the conclusion that RCRA sites should be placed on the NPL if their owners or operators exhibit an unwillingness or inability to undertake corrective action. At these two sites, the Agency has concluded that the owner/operators' unwillingness to undertake remedial planning and/or removal activities is an indication that the owners or operators would also be unwilling to undertake remedial actions if they are required. Therefore, the rationale for placing them on the NPL now is the same rationale that underlies the basic policy announced today. Consequently, the Agency has concluded that listing these two sites at this time is appropriate.

As explained below, the Agency will continue to develop more precise criteria which identify those RCRA sites which should be listed on the NPL based upon the owner/operators' unwillingness to undertake corrective action. Until those criteria are delineated more clearly, the Agency believes it appropriate to place or retain sites on the NPL on a case-by-case basis. This is particularly true for sites where CERCLA-financed activities are now in progress, since developing more precise criteria to determine unwillingness may take a substantial period of time.

Once a complete, final RCRA listing policy is developed, this component of the RCRA policy will be withdrawn.

Sites will be addressed under RCRA in the first instance unless they fit within one of the exception categories that are included in the complete final policy.

C. Components of Proposed RCRA Policy

In addition to the circumstances identified in the final portion of the RCRA listing policy, there are other situations for which the exercise of RCRA authorities may not result in expeditious or adequate remedial action and, therefore, NPL eligibility should also be considered. For example, even though an owner/operator is not bankrupt or has not lost authorization to operate, he may have failed to comply sufficiently with a permit condition or an order issued pursuant to RCRA authorities or may not have adequately closed a facility in accordance with an approved closure plan. The Agency is considering providing more specificity to the third component of today's policy by proposing in a separate notice of today's **Federal Register** that sites falling into the categories below would be eligible for the NPL.

1. *Facilities whose owners or operators have not complied adequately with an administrative order, judicial action, or a RCRA permit condition requiring response or corrective action.* As a general matter, the Agency would prefer to use RCRA permit or enforcement authorities to secure corrective actions at RCRA sites. When a facility owner fails to adequately carry out corrective action activities, there is little assurance that releases will be addressed in an appropriate manner. Such facilities should be eligible for listing in order to make CERCLA authorities available expeditiously. Although the Agency has not previously taken into account compliance with corrective action requirements in a permit or a federal enforcement action when considering a site for listing, Congress deliberately expanded the scope of the RCRA corrective action authorities. Accordingly, it is appropriate for the Agency to rely on these authorities. When an owner/operator fails to comply adequately with a RCRA corrective action requirement, however, it means that CERCLA remedial action may be needed to protect human health and the environment. By making these facilities eligible for listing, the Agency provides that appropriate CERCLA-financed remedial action can occur expeditiously.

2. *Facilities whose owners or operators have not submitted or implemented an adequate closure plan.* Adequate closure of a RCRA facility is integrally related to prevention of future

releases and often involves measures similar to those undertaken during corrective action, such as waste removal, excavation of contaminated soil and capping. Similarly, where an owner or operator is unwilling to carry out such activities there is a need to ensure that CERCLA will be available.

If the Agency decides to incorporate into the final RCRA listing policy a component that allows listing of sites in the two categories described above, an important issue will be how the Agency establishes that there has not been adequate compliance with RCRA requirements relating to corrective action or closure. If non-compliance is established through a determination by an administrative law judge or a court, there may be delays in employing CERCLA to respond to problems at these sites. It may be more appropriate, therefore, for the Agency to base its decision to list sites on the NPL under this criterion based upon the issuance of an administrative order or initiation of a judicial action to enforce corrective action requirements imposed by permit or order or in a closure plan. In a separate notice in today's **Federal Register**, the Agency specifically solicits comments on how and when it should determine that the likelihood of compliance with RCRA requirements is low enough that a RCRA site should be eligible for the NPL.

As explained above, the components of the Agency's policy with respect to sites that may be subject to RCRA corrective action are designed to ensure that RCRA authorities are employed first except where there are indications that an owner or operator is unwilling or unable to perform corrective action. The Agency has identified three categories of sites for which there are indications of unwillingness or inability to carry out corrective action and has announced that facilities in those categories will be eligible for the NPL. EPA may not have identified all types of sites for which the exercise of RCRA authorities may not result in timely and appropriate remedial action and invites commenters, in a separate notice in today's **Federal Register**, to suggest other categories of RCRA sites that should be considered eligible for the NPL. For example, additional categories that may merit inclusion are RCRA facilities whose owners or operators did not notify the appropriate authority that they treat, store, or dispose of RCRA Subtitle C hazardous waste or did not submit the required permit applications or who have otherwise indicated an unwillingness to undertake corrective action.

The Agency will consider supplementing the RCRA listing policy announced today if comments or the Agency's experience with the new policy demonstrate that additional categories of RCRA-related sites should be placed on the NPL to ensure appropriate and expeditious remedial action.

D. Application of the Final RCRA Policy to Currently Proposed Sites

The Agency is promulgating six RCRA sites today. These six sites fall within the scope of the final policy defining NPL-eligible RCRA sites. Four of the six sites are bankrupt and two sites, proposed prior to HSWA, meet the third criterion of the RCRA policy as explained above. The RCRA-related sites promulgated in this final rule are:

Bankrupt Sites:

- Interstate Lead Co. (ILCO), Inc., Leeds, Alabama
- Thermo-Chem, Inc., Muskegon, Michigan
- Whitmoyer Laboratories, Jackson Township, Pennsylvania
- American Creosote Works, Inc. (Jackson Plant), Jackson, Tennessee

Sites deemed unwilling to perform remedial action:

- Operating Industries, Inc., Landfill, Monterey Park, California
- L.A. Clarke & Son, Spotsylvania County, Virginia

The L.A. Clarke & Son site also appears to qualify under the second component of the final listing policy.

The remainder of the RCRA-related sites proposed in October 1984 will remain in proposed status until the Agency evaluates their RCRA status in order to determine whether they are eligible for the NPL based on this new policy. Elsewhere in today's *Federal Register*, in the notice describing the proposed components of the RCRA policy, EPA invites the owner/operators of the remaining 31 proposed facilities, and any other persons, to provide any information that would assist EPA in evaluating: (1) The facility's status under RCRA and (2) the relationship this information has to the final and proposed elements of the new RCRA policy discussed above.

E. Application of Policy to Final NPL Sites

The Agency plans to review the status of and apply this policy to RCRA sites that are already listed on the final NPL. NPL sites that are not subject to Subtitle C corrective action requirements or RCRA facilities that are eligible for the NPL based on the final or proposed policy announced today will continue to

be listed on the NPL. The remaining sites will be deleted. Elsewhere in today's *Federal Register*, in a notice describing the proposed components of the RCRA policy, the Agency invites the owners or operators of facilities on the proposed or final NPL, or other persons, to provide information that would assist EPA in evaluating: (1) the facility's status under RCRA and (2) the relationship this information has to the final and proposed elements of the new RCRA policy.

F. Federal Sites

Application of this policy with respect to Federal facilities will be addressed at a later date. The Agency is working to resolve a number of issues associated with Federal facilities and will coordinate application of this policy with those efforts.

G. Response to Public Comments on Proposed Policy for RCRA-Related Sites

On April 10, 1985, (50 FR 14110), the Agency proposed a policy for deferring listing of RCRA sites and for deletion from the NPL of RCRA sites currently proposed or promulgated on the NPL. The policy proposed at that time is summarized elsewhere in this preamble. The Agency received a number of comments on the April 1985 proposal and on the reiteration of the proposal in the September 1985 preamble to NPL Update #4. These comments can be summarized as falling within five broad categories:

- Support for the proposed policy
- Concern about flexibility in the proposed policy
- Suggested revisions to the proposed criteria for deferring the listing of RCRA facilities
- Revisions to the proposed criteria for deleting RCRA facilities from the NPL
- Suggested need for greater flexibility in dealing with sites under RCRA

Responses to the significant comments on the policy are presented below.

1. *Support for proposed policy.* All but two commenters specifically stated that they supported the policy proposed by the Agency, and the other two comments generally were favorable. (One raised a technical issue about the proposed deletion criteria; the other stated that, while the proposed policy was reasonable and that there was no objection to it, the Agency needed to retain the flexibility to deal with RCRA sites under CERCLA first when circumstances warranted such an approach.)

The commenters presented four basic reasons for supporting the proposed policy:

- Policy better reflects the intent of both CERCLA and HSWA
- Policy preserves the limited CERCLA Trust Fund monies for their intended use
- HSWA eliminates the need for listing most RCRA sites on the NPL
- RCRA authorities provide more effective and efficient means for cleanup of RCRA sites than CERCLA authorities

Comment: Commenters stated that they supported the proposed policy because they believed that it reflects the intent of both CERCLA and HSWA. Several commenters asserted that CERCLA was intended to address only those abandoned or inactive sites for which there is no responsible party capable of assuming financial obligations for corrective action. These commenters noted that by deferring NPL listing of RCRA sites, the limited CERCLA Trust Fund monies would be preserved for use at abandoned or inactive sites. Commenters also indicated that deferring listing of RCRA sites would provide an incentive for facility owner/operators to conduct cleanup activities.

Response: While the Agency agrees that responsible parties should bear the cost of response activities, the Agency does not agree that CERCLA is intended to address only those abandoned or inactive sites for which there is no responsible party able to assume financial obligation for response costs. CERCLA authority exists regardless of whether responsible parties can be identified. It is appropriate to expend CERCLA funds to respond to releases at RCRA sites where there is a responsible party who is unwilling or unable to undertake response actions. Section 107 of CERCLA specifically provides for the recovery, from responsible parties, of Fund monies spent for response actions in such situations.

Furthermore, the listing of a site on the NPL does not mean that Fund monies will automatically be spent for remedial action or study at that site. In many instances, these activities will still be funded by the responsible party. The Agency agrees, however, that by addressing sites under RCRA that appear likely to be cleaned up adequately through the use of RCRA authorities, more CERCLA funds may be available for sites that cannot be addressed under RCRA. This is one of the purposes of the policy announced today. The Agency also agrees and hopes that today's policy may act as an incentive to owners/operators of RCRA

sites to comply with RCRA requirements and, in particular, to take whatever corrective actions are appropriate without the need for the Agency to place their sites on the NPL.

Comment: In supporting the proposed policy, a few commenters noted that HSWA effectively eliminates any distinction in RCRA authority with regard to regulated and nonregulated units at a RCRA facility. The commenters indicated that HSWA provides ample authorities to ensure that corrective actions are conducted at facilities having RCRA permits or interim status. As a result, the commenters stated that there was no longer any reason to continue the current NPL policy of listing those RCRA facilities where a significant portion of a release appeared to originate from a nonregulated unit. These commenters indicated that the Agency should first apply its RCRA authorities to these facilities before proceeding under CERCLA.

Response: The Agency agrees that there is no longer a reason for distinguishing releases at regulated units from other releases that can be addressed under the expanded HSWA authorities. Today's policy eliminates this distinction.

Comment: Some commenters expressed support for the proposed policy because they believed it would be more effective and efficient to use RCRA authorities, rather than CERCLA authorities, to clean up RCRA facilities. They indicated that dealing with RCRA facilities under the RCRA program would avoid duplication of technical review and enforcement efforts under the CERCLA program. This would save time and money for both the Agency and facility owners/operators and ensure that facilities are addressed in a consistent and uniform manner. One commenter further stated that by deferring the listing of Subtitle C commercial waste management facilities, these facilities would be more likely to remain solvent (and thus pay for their own corrective actions under RCRA) because generators would be more likely to send wastes to them if they were not listed on the NPL. This commenter also indicated that RCRA facilities would be better able to obtain insurance required for continued operation under Subtitle C if they were not listed on the NPL.

Response: The Agency agrees that it is generally more desirable to deal with RCRA facilities under RCRA authorities than under CERCLA authorities. This is the intent of the policy announced today. If facilities being deferred from listing do not ultimately have to be

addressed under CERCLA, the policy is likely to reduce duplication of effort and save time and resources. Placing a site on the NPL does not impose liability upon anyone or necessarily result in the expenditure of funds for remedial action. It may be the case, however, that some RCRA facilities may derive some incidental benefits from not being placed on the NPL. However, the policy is not designed to protect the financial integrity of the owner/operator; it is designed to provide a framework for most effectively addressing releases that may affect public health and the environment.

Comment: In supporting the proposed policy, one commenter stated that the only advantage of using CERCLA rather than RCRA is public notification through the NPL listing process. The commenter noted that RCRA imposes several public notification requirements. If public listing is deemed absolutely necessary, public listing of RCRA Part B applications receiving priority attention because of ground water problems could be implemented.

Response: EPA does not believe, at this time, that it is necessary to publish a separate list of RCRA facilities with ground water problems that are seeking Part B permits. The RCRA regulations now require public notification when new Part B permits are under consideration, when major modifications are proposed to a Part B permit, and when a facility is closing. At that time the affected public is given adequate notice of pending actions that would address releases to all media, including ground water. In addition, the Agency will develop a public participation process for interim status corrective action orders.

2. Concern about flexibility in the proposed policy.

Comment: One commenter stated that while the proposed policy was reasonable, the Agency needs to retain some flexibility to address RCRA sites under CERCLA first when that approach would lead to a more expeditious remedy or would allow for a more equitable distribution of costs. The commenter stated that flexibility in the initial choice of authority would: (1) provide more options for site remedies, (2) ensure that the maximum number of parties are involved, and (3) possibly prevent a single company from shouldering an unexpected and inequitable share of cleanup responsibility since previous owners and generators may be drawn in as responsible parties under CERCLA.

Response: After examining this issue, the Agency has concluded that, to the extent practicable, it is better to identify

in the policy those categories of RCRA facilities that are eligible for the NPL than to determine for each facility whether a release should first be addressed under RCRA or CERCLA. The policy announced today is designed to ensure that RCRA authorities are employed first at facilities that do not fall within the final eligibility categories. The policy allows all interested persons to know whether a particular facility may be considered eligible for NPL listing.

Under today's policy, the Agency foregoes some flexibility in the mechanisms for obtaining site remedies by limiting the use of CERCLA-financed remedial action to certain categories of RCRA sites. However, RCRA affords flexibility comparable to CERCLA for selecting technical remedies for responding to releases. Thus, employing RCRA corrective action authorities is expected to achieve protection of public health and the environment as effectively as remedies achieved under CERCLA. The Agency's goal is to develop RCRA corrective action requirements that remove inconsistencies between remedial actions performed under CERCLA and corrective actions performed under RCRA. Under the National Contingency Plan, the Agency now attempts to make the two programs consistent by having CERCLA actions meet RCRA technical requirements where they are applicable.

With regard to the commenter's concern about the equitable distribution of response costs, in situations where an owner/operator who has performed a response action feels that there are additional responsible parties who should share the response costs, the owner/operator may seek recovery of these response costs from other parties.

Comment: One commenter argued against allowing States the flexibility to decide whether to pursue remedies under CERCLA or RCRA. The commenter indicated that States will choose CERCLA rather than RCRA regulatory authorities if presented a choice, primarily because CERCLA provides funds to a State for its activities while RCRA does not.

Response: EPA, not the States, decides which sites are listed on the NPL. Only those sites that meet the eligibility criteria promulgated by EPA may be listed. States may recommend sites for the NPL, but State concurrence is not required for listing. The policy announced today specifies categories of RCRA facilities for which the Agency believes the use of CERCLA authorities is appropriate. CERCLA authorities will be used to address only those RCRA

facilities for which the exercise of RCRA authorities is not likely to result in appropriate cleanup activities.

3. *Suggested revisions to proposed criteria for deferring listing of RCRA facilities.* A number of commenters who indicated support for the proposed policy suggested criteria for use in determining when a RCRA facility is to be deferred from listing. The various criteria suggested by these commenters include the following:

- Financial ability of the facility owner/operator to carry out corrective action
- Willingness of the facility owner/operator to carry out corrective action
- Availability of sufficient legal guarantees to ensure that corrective action will be carried out
- Existence of ongoing litigation concerning corrective action at the facility
- Issuance or likelihood of issuance of a Subtitle C permit

For the most part, the commenters did not suggest specific means for evaluating these criteria (e.g., how financial inability would be determined). The criteria suggested by each commenter are discussed below.

Comment: One commenter suggested that listing should be deferred for sites meeting all of the following criteria:

- The owner/operator is a permittee or operator of an interim status site subject to the jurisdiction of RCRA,
- The owner/operator has admitted responsibility for performance of any needed corrective action at the facility,
- The owner/operator is not presently subject to any proceedings in bankruptcy, and
- The owner/operator is willing to agree to perform analytical work or remedial action pursuant to the applicable RCRA enforcement provisions and the enter into a consent decree with the appropriate agency upon these terms.

Response: The Agency believes that the policy announced today essentially incorporates the basic ideas suggested by this commenter: that where the owner/operator is not bankrupt and exhibits a willingness to undertake necessary response action, the facility should be deferred from listing on the NPL. However, it may not be desirable for the Agency to always defer listing a site at which an owner/operator has entered into an agreement to perform appropriate studies or remedial action. For example, the RCRA listing policy proposed elsewhere in today's **Federal Register** would address situations in which an owner/operator who may have entered into a consent agreement

fails to comply adequately with its terms.

Comment: Another commenter stated that the proposed policy was more stringent than necessary and stated that deferral of NPL listing and deletion of proposed or promulgated sites from the NPL should occur if the site meets all of the following criteria:

- The facility has completed its Part B permit application,
- The Part B permit application, the permit itself if issued, or other relevant administrative or judicial consent decree addresses the releases which are the subject of the HRS score that led to eligibility for NPL listing in the first instance, and
- There is sufficient legal guarantee, by way of court order and/or enforceable permit terms and conditions, which assures that the releases to be addressed will in fact be addressed, and there is adequate financial assurance that the costs of such actions are within the means of the facility.

Response: The Agency believes that the final policy announced today incorporates some elements suggested by this commenter. The Agency, like the commenter, is concerned about the sufficiency of legal guarantees and the adequacy of financial assurances for corrective action. Pursuant to HSWA, the Agency is developing regulations under which facilities seeking RCRA permits will be required to demonstrate financial responsibility for corrective action.

The Agency does not, however, agree with the commenter's suggestion that only facilities that have completed RCRA Part B permit applications should be deferred from NPL listing. Pursuant to Section 3008(h) of RCRA, the Agency has the authority to require corrective action at interim status facilities. Interim status facilities that have not completed Part B permit applications should thus be deferred, like any other RCRA facility, unless the site falls within the categories of sites that are eligible for NPL listing under today's final and proposed policy. Facilities that have lost interim status under RCRA sections 3005(c), 3005(e), or 3008(h) are eligible for the NPL under the second component of today's final policy.

Comment: One other commenter stated that RCRA sites that are currently in litigation should not be placed on the NPL after a civil suit has been started. The commenter noted that NPL listing could be interpreted as an effort to influence the outcome of the case. The commenter indicated that listing is unnecessary in such cases because action is already taking place and the

litigation serves the NPL purpose of identifying sites requiring action.

Response: The Agency does not agree that NPL listing would influence the outcome of litigation. As has been explained repeatedly in preambles to NPL rulemakings, the NPL is primarily an informational tool for use by the Agency in identifying sites that appear to present a significant risk to public health or the environment. Placing a site on the NPL is not intended to influence litigation over candidate sites. Rather, NPL listing is intended to guide the Agency in determining which sites warrant further investigation and consideration for Fund-financed response. Inclusion of a site on the NPL does not establish that the Agency necessarily will undertake response action, does not in itself reflect a judgment of the adequacy of the activities of any person, does not require any person to undertake any action, nor does it assign any liability to any person.

Furthermore, the Agency does not agree that listing is unnecessary for all sites that are in litigation. In those situations where the circumstances at the site which gave rise to the litigation reflect an unwillingness of an owner/operator to undertake necessary response activities, the Agency believes it may be appropriate to place the site on the NPL. The policy announced today reflects the Agency's concern about such situations. The second component of today's final policy considers the compliance history of sites that have lost interim status. On-going litigation would not prevent a site from being listed under this component of the policy if the criteria are met. The proposed policy announced elsewhere in today's **Federal Register** considers the adequacy of compliance in other situations, many of which will involve ongoing litigation.

Comment: Another commenter expressed support for deferring the NPL listing of RCRA facilities until it can be proven that corrective action would not be adequate under RCRA Subtitle C permit provisions, RCRA section 7003 imminent hazard provisions or CERCLA Section 106 abatement action provisions.

Response: Under the proposed component of the policy announced today, the Agency would place on the NPL sites at which the owner/operators were not complying with RCRA Subtitle C permit conditions or with orders or judicial actions requiring corrective action. The Agency does not agree that inadequate compliance with corrective action requirements of permits, RCRA section 7003 orders or CERCLA section

106 orders should be the only basis for NPL listing of RCRA sites. Today's announcement describes other criteria to be used by the Agency for listing RCRA sites and the rationale for their inclusion in the policy.

Comment: One other commenter indicated that CERCLA should apply to RCRA facilities only in those situations which represent an imminent and substantial danger or where there are no responsible parties in a position to assume financial obligations.

Response: Reasons for not limiting today's policy to situations where there are no responsible parties capable of assuming financial obligations have previously been discussed. The Agency also does not agree that CERCLA should be employed at RCRA facilities only in situations which represent an imminent and substantial danger. Section 104 of CERCLA provides response authorities for situations in which there is a release which may not present an imminent and substantial danger to public health or welfare. It would be appropriate to take CERCLA action at RCRA facilities that are eligible for the NPL under today's policy, but at which imminent and substantial endangerment has not been demonstrated.

Comment: Another commenter supported the concept that sites that could be covered under other statutes, especially RCRA, need not and should not be listed on the NPL.

Response: As is discussed above, there are some RCRA sites that the Agency believes should be listed on the NPL. Some statutes administered by Agencies other than EPA provide authorities that can be used to effect remedial action at certain types of sites that can also be addressed under CERCLA. The Agency's current policies with respect to such sites have been discussed in previous NPL rulemakings. If changes in these policies are considered, public comments will be solicited at that time.

4. Suggested revisions to proposed criteria for deleting RCRA facilities from the NPL. Two commenters raised issues about the policy proposed for determining whether RCRA facilities currently proposed for or promulgated on the NPL should be deleted from the NPL.

Comment: One commenter supported the proposed criteria, but indicated that the Agency needs to explicitly state that RCRA sites will not be deleted from the NPL if remedial investigation/feasibility studies, remedial designs, remedial actions, or other similar actions have been initiated or implemented at the NPL site. The commenter indicated that this provision should apply to both

Fund-finances activities as well as voluntary activities being conducted by responsible parties.

Response: As discussed elsewhere in this preamble, two RCRA-related sites at which there is ongoing Fund-financed remedial planning are today being listed on the NPL under the second component of the final RCRA listing policy.

The Agency does not, however, believe that there is any reason to retain on the NPL those RCRA sites at which voluntary (non-Fund-financed) activities are being conducted by responsible parties since the voluntary action indicates a willingness by these parties to undertake necessary response actions under RCRA. If these response actions are not adequately carried out, then these facilities would become eligible for NPL listing if the proposed components of today's policy, announced elsewhere in today's *Federal Register*, are adopted.

Comment: Another commenter indicated that the two criteria proposed for deleting sites from the NPL were more stringent than the criteria proposed for deferral of NPL listing. The commenter indicated that the criteria for deletion should be identical to the criteria for deferring NPL listing, except in those instances where some current obligations of the Fund, or the legal ability of the Fund to recover monies expended, may be adversely affected.

Response: The final and proposed components of the RCRA sites policy announced today that will be used in deleting RCRA sites from the NPL are identical to those components that will be used in deferring RCRA sites from NPL listing.

5. Suggested need for greater flexibility in dealing with sites under RCRA.

Comment: Two commenters supporting the policy proposal noted that in applying the policy, for those sites shifted to administration under RCRA rather than CERCLA, the Agency needs to retain flexibility in the remedial action standards being applied by the RCRA program to the different units at these sites. They stated that different standards needed to be applied to new or active RCRA units, inactive hazardous waste management units, and solid waste management units. One commenter indicated that RCRA standards should not be applied retroactively to pre-RCRA waste management units. The other stated that flexible, efficient, and cost-effective remedial responses should be applied to site-specific conditions at inactive units or solid waste management units rather than requiring these units to comply with standards applicable to new

hazardous waste management units. Sections 3004(o) and 3005(f) of HSWA were cited as justification for distinguishing requirements at new and existing facilities, and Sections 4001 through 4010 were cited as justification for distinguishing among hazardous and non-hazardous waste management units.

One other commenter stated that by having RCRA-related facilities handled entirely through RCRA, artificial distinctions among releases based on the status of a solid waste management unit may be eliminated. The commenter noted that pollution conditions do not respect distinctions in time or place. The commenter indicated that it is far better from a legal, administrative, and technical perspective for an entire facility and all releases and potential releases from the facility to be dealt with in a uniform manner and by a single review.

Response: The Agency does not believe that these issues are relevant to listing of sites on the NPL. These issues are, however, relevant to the implementation of the RCRA corrective action program and are being considered in deliberations on the development of the corrective action program. These will be addressed when the Agency issues regulations and/or guidance on the implementation of the corrective action program.

Releases of Mining Wastes

The Agency's position, as discussed in the preamble to previous final NPL rulemakings (48 FR 40658, September 8, 1983; 49 FR 37070, September 21, 1984) is that mining wastes may be hazardous substances, pollutants or contaminants under CERCLA and, therefore, are eligible for listing on the NPL. This position was affirmed in 1985 by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit (*Eagle-Picher Industries, Inc. v. EPA*, 759 F.2d 905, D.C. Cir. 1985).

In the past, EPA has included mining waste sites on the NPL. Eight mining sites were included in the October 15, 1984, Update #2 proposal. In subsequent proposals, however, EPA has considered whether mining sites could be addressed satisfactorily under the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (SMCRA) before deciding whether to place them on the NPL. EPA has initiated discussions with the U.S. Department of the Interior (DOI) to determine if DOI or the State could take appropriate action under SMCRA to protect public health and the environment at these sites.

EPA is including six of the eight mining sites that were proposed for Update #2 in today's rulemaking. Four of these sites are being placed on the NPL because they are non-coal sites with mining operations that occurred after the enactment date of SMCRA (August 3, 1977); therefore these sites are neither regulated by SMCRA nor eligible for reclamation funds from the SMCRA Abandoned Mine Land Reclamation (AMLR) Program. These sites are:

- Eagle Mine, Minturn/Redcliff, Colorado
- Smuggler Mountain, Pitkin County, Colorado
- Uravan Uranium Project (Union Carbide Corp.), Uravan, Colorado
- Silver Mountain Mine, Loomis, Washington

One site Torch Lake, Houghton County, Michigan, is being placed on the NPL because the State of Michigan does not have an approved SMCRA program and, consequently, the site is not eligible for reclamation funds from the SMCRA AMLR program.

The Mayflower Tailings Site in Wasatch County, Utah, will not be placed on the NPL at this time because, in response to public comments, its HRS score dropped below 28.50. This site is discussed in more detail in the "Support Document for the Revised National Priorities List—1986."

The remaining two mining sites proposed in Update #2—Olson/Neihart Reservoir, Wasatch County, Utah and Sharon Steel (Midvale Tailings), Midvale, Utah—ceased mining before the enactment date of SMCRA and therefore may be eligible for reclamation funds under SMCRA. Until EPA explores this issue further, these sites remain in proposed status. EPA will announce in a future NPL rulemaking what relationship SMCRA activities will have to NPL listing decisions.

A number of comments were received on the proposal of these mining sites in Update #2. One commenter stated that Congress recognized the unique characteristics of mining wastes and expressly excluded mining wastes from EPA's regulatory authority under RCRA and CERCLA.

EPA disagrees with the commenter. The *Eagle-Picher* decision has affirmed the Agency's decision that mining wastes may be "hazardous substances, pollutants or contaminants" under CERCLA.

Several commenters stated that the HRS is biased against high-volume, low-hazard wastes, such as mining wastes. The commenter said EPA is unable to provide the evidence required by law that the HRS is a rational basis on

which to rank mining sites for inclusion on the NPL.

The issue of bias against mining wastes has been raised by commenters in previous NPL rulemakings, and EPA's responses can be found in the preambles to these rulemakings (48 FR 40663, September 8, 1983; and 49 FR 37075, September 21, 1984). Specifically, EPA believes that there is ample evidence that the concentrations and amounts of pollutants and contaminants discharged by mining sites can and do pose a significant threat to public health and the environment. Mining sites tend to generate extremely large quantities of wastes. Thus, even though the concentration of hazardous substances in mining waste may be low, the total quantities of hazardous substances available to be discharged into the environment are often large.

Furthermore, the waste-quantity factor in the HRS is only one factor, and is generally not as important as population, toxicity, and likelihood of a release. This relatively low emphasis on waste quantity reflects the fact that the HRS was designed to score a wide variety of releases and potential releases of hazardous substances, including mining sites.

Another commenter stated that the proposed listing of mining sites violates the Constitutional prohibition against ex post facto regulation and denies mining companies the due process protection of property rights guaranteed by the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution. The commenter also stated that listing mining sites on the NPL violates Executive Order 12291 by failing to consider the tremendous costs to the mining industry.

The Agency believes that the commenter's arguments are groundless. Placing a site on the NPL does not deprive any property owner of property, nor does it create liability or impose any costs. Listing on the NPL does not establish that EPA will necessarily undertake response action, nor does it require any action by any private party or determine liability for site response costs. Costs that arise out of site responses result from site-by-site decisions about what actions to take, not from the act of listing itself.

Releases of Pesticides Registered Under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA)

The proposal of NPL Update #2 (49 FR 40320, October 15, 1984) included six sites in South Central Oahu, Hawaii, where parts of the basal aquifer have been contaminated by pesticides, including ethylene dibromide (EDB), dibromochloropropane (DBCP), and

trichloropropane (TCP), a likely contaminant of the pesticide D-D (which contains 1,2-dichloropropane, 1,3-dichloropropene and related C3 compounds). These six sites were the first sites proposed for the NPL on the basis of releases which appear to originate entirely from the application of pesticides registered under FIFRA.

The Agency has received numerous comments on the listing of the Hawaii pesticide sites. The Agency is continuing to evaluate these sites in the context of an overall policy with respect to sites at which contamination results from the application of FIFRA-registered pesticides. Therefore, the Agency has not reached a final decision on listing of these six sites on the NPL and is deferring final rulemaking on these sites at this time.

Releases of Radioactive Materials

Section 101(22) of CERCLA excludes several types of releases of radioactive materials from the statutory definition of "release." These releases are therefore not eligible for CERCLA response actions or inclusion on the NPL. As a policy matter, EPA has also chosen not to list releases of source, by-product, or special nuclear material from any facility with a current license issued by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), on the grounds that the NRC has full authority to require cleanup of releases from such facilities. Formerly licensed facilities whose licenses no longer are in effect will, however, be considered for listing.

These exclusions and policies are discussed in the preambles to previous NPL rulemakings (47 FR 58477, December 30, 1982; 48 FR 40661, September 8, 1983; and 49 FR 37074, September 21, 1984) and remain the same.

Four sites containing radioactive waste are being placed on the NPL in today's rulemaking. One site—the Lodi Municipal Well in Lodi, New Jersey—will remain in proposed status while EPA evaluates additional technical information.

V. Generic HRS Issues

The Agency received a total of 607 comments on proposed NPL Update #2. Of these, 543 comments pertained to 126 of the proposed sites, including the 36 Federal facility sites. The remainder of the comments addressed sites that were not proposed, or were generic or technical issues that were not site-specific. Comments regarding specific sites are addressed in the "Support Document for the Revised National Priorities List—1986."

Many commenters raised issues that have been raised in previous NPL rulemakings. These issues are discussed in the preambles to previous rulemakings (48 FR 40658, September 8, 1983; 49 FR 37070, September 21, 1984). The Agency's position on these issues remains unchanged. Many of these comments criticized the HRS. Since the HRS was promulgated as a final rule in July 1982 (47 FR 31219), these comments cannot affect the scoring of the sites proposed in October 1984.

EPA's responses to public comments on generic HRS issues are presented in this section of the preamble.

Waste Quantity

A number of commenters said that the waste quantity values assigned under the HRS were too high because EPA had included the nonhazardous constituents of the hazardous substances in calculating the quantity of waste located at the facility. Commenters raised similar issues in previous final NPL rulemakings and EPA's response remains unchanged (48 FR 40664, September 8, 1983; 49 FR 37077, September 31, 1984).

Consideration of Flow Gradients

Several commenters argued that EPA should consider hydrogeologic information on the direction of ground-water flow when assigning an HRS score to population served by ground water. As was the case with the waste quantity issue, this issue was addressed in previous NPL rulemakings (48 FR 40664, September 8, 1983; 49 FR 37077, September 21, 1984). The rationale for the Agency's approach is further discussed in the preamble to the NCP (47 FR 31190, July 16, 1982) and is equally applicable now.

Scoring on the Basis of Current Conditions

Many commenters stated that EPA should take current conditions into account when scoring a site where response actions have reduced the hazards posed by the site. In response, EPA computes HRS scores and lists sites on the basis of conditions existing before any response actions are taken in order to represent the full scope of the original problem presented by a site. This policy was explained in the preamble to the final revisions to the NCP (47 FR 31187, July 16, 1982), and in previous NPL rulemakings (48 FR 40664, September 8, 1983; 49 FR 37078, September 21, 1984). The Agency's position remains unchanged.

Small Observed Release

Some commenters maintained that EPA should not assign a value for an observed release to ground water when the concentration of contaminant is below the regulatory limits specified under the Safe Drinking Water Act or other Federal and State laws. Similar comments were raised in previous final NPL rulemakings (48 FR 40665, September 8, 1983; 49 FR 37078, September 21, 1984), and EPA's response remains unchanged. The HRS does not define the chemicals of concern to be only those which meet or exceed a State's primary or secondary drinking water standards. An observed release is considered to have occurred if contaminants are detected at levels significantly above background levels.

VI. Disposition of Proposed Sites

Of the 244 sites proposed for the NPL on October 15, 1984, two New Jersey sites—the Glen Ridge Radium Site and the Montclair/West Orange Radium

Site—were promulgated in a separate rulemaking on February 14, 1985 (50 FR 6320). On September 21, 1984 (49 FR 37070), EPA deferred rulemaking on four sites originally proposed in the first update to the NPL (48 FR 40674, September 8, 1983). EPA has thoroughly reviewed the comments received on these 246 proposed sites and its decisions on the status of these sites are discussed in this section.

In addition to the 246 sites proposed in September 1983, and October 1984, EPA is including in today's rulemaking 7 sites from NPL Update #3 (50 FR 14115, April 10, 1985) and 13 sites from NPL Update #4 (50 FR 37950, September 18, 1985) that did not receive public comments. The inclusion of these 20 sites brings the number of sites discussed in today's rulemaking to 266. Of these sites, 170 are being added to the final NPL. EPA has not made a decision on 88 sites (including the 36 Federal facility sites and the 31 RCRA-related sites), and these sites will continue to be proposed. One site was repropoed on September 18, 1985, as part of NPL Update #4 (50 FR 37950). Final scores for seven sites have dropped below 28.50 and will not be included on the NPL at this time.

Final Sites With HRS Score Changes

For 18 of the 170 sites promulgated today, EPA has revised the HRS scores based on its review of comments and additional information. Although these changes have no effect on listing, some of the changes have resulted in the sites being placed in different groups of 50 sites. These sites are presented in Table 1.

TABLE 1.—FINAL SITES WITH HRS SCORE CHANGES

| State and Site Name | City | HRS Score | |
|--|-------------------|-----------|-------|
| | | Proposed | Final |
| California: | | | |
| Operating Industries, Inc., Landfill | Monterey Park | 47.91 | 57.22 |
| Intel Corp. (Mountain View Plant) | Mountain View | 31.94 | 29.76 |
| Raytheon Corp. | Mountain View | 37.93 | 28.76 |
| Colorado: Smuggler Mountain | Pitkin County | 44.78 | 31.31 |
| Illinois: Pagel's Pit | Rockland | 42.47 | 45.91 |
| Indiana: International Minerals & Chemicals Corp. (Terre Haute East Plant) | Terre Haute | 48.91 | 57.80 |
| Minnesota: | | | |
| Agate Lake Scrapyard | Fairview Township | 31.24 | 29.68 |
| Kummer Sanitary Landfill | Bemidji | 42.37 | 35.57 |
| Olmsted County Sanitary Landfill | Oronoco | 33.62 | 40.70 |
| New York: | | | |
| BEC Trucking | Vestal | 30.76 | 30.75 |
| Hooker Chemical/Ruco Polymer Corp. | Hicksville | 48.01 | 41.60 |
| North Carolina: North Carolina State University (Lot #86, Farm Unit #1) | Raleigh | 51.93 | 48.36 |
| Ohio: | | | |
| AlSCO Anaconda | Gnadenhutten | 48.67 | 42.94 |

TABLE 1.—FINAL SITES WITH HRS SCORE CHANGES—Continued

| State and Site Name | City | HRS Score | |
|---|---------------------|-----------|-------|
| | | Proposed | Final |
| Industrial Excess Landfill | Uniontown | 57.80 | 51.13 |
| Sanitary Landfill Co. (Industrial Waste Disposal Co., Inc.) | Dayton | 31.94 | 35.57 |
| Pennsylvania: Westinghouse Elevator Co. Plant | Cumberland Township | 36.38 | 36.37 |
| Wisconsin: National Presto Industries, Inc. | Eau Claire | 38.54 | 42.39 |
| Stoughton City Landfill | Stoughton | 32.45 | 35.79 |

Previously Proposed Sites

On September 21, 1984, EPA deferred rulemaking on four sites (Olin Corp.—Areas 1, 2, & 4, Augusta, Georgia; Sand Springs Petrochemical Complex, Sand Springs, Oklahoma; Pig Road, New Waverly, Texas; and Quail Run Mobile Manor, Gray Summit, Missouri) that had been included in the first proposed update to the NPL (48 FR 40674, September 8, 1983).

EPA determined in the promulgation of the first Update (49 FR 37070, September 21, 1984) that the HRS scoring documents on which the proposed rulemaking for the Olin Corp. Site and the Sand Springs Petrochemical Complex Site was based were not in the public docket and were not available to the public during the 60-day comment period for that proposed rule. Therefore, EPA allowed further comment on these sites for a period of 60 days following publication of the final rule. Interested parties were given the opportunity to inspect the HRS scoring documents for these two sites.

During the comment period, EPA received additional comments on the Olin Corp. (Areas 1, 2 & 4) Site. However, the Agency is continuing this site in proposed status because it is an RCRA-related site that may be deferred under the revised RCRA-related site listing policy.

No additional comments were received on the Sand Springs Petrochemical Site after the proper HRS documents were placed into the docket for public review. Therefore, the HRS score remains the same, and this site is included in today's final rulemaking. Disposition of the two remaining sites in the September 1983 proposal will be discussed later in this section.

Sites With Scores Below 28.50

In evaluating the comments received in response to the proposal of NPL Update #2 (49 FR 40320, October 15, 1984), the Agency revised the proposed HRS scores for seven sites. The final HRS scores for these sites are now below the cut-off score of 28.50 and will not be included on the NPL. A summary of the comments and EPA's response are

recorded in the "Support Document for the Revised National Priorities List—1986." These sites are listed in Table 2.

Table 2.—Sites Dropped From Consideration (Scores Below 28.50)

State, Site Name, and City

California: Precision Monolithic, Inc.—Santa Clara
 Florida: Davidson Lumber Co.—South Miami
 Michigan: Lenawee Disposal Service, Inc., Landfill—Adrian
 New Jersey: Jame Fine Chemical—Bound Brook
 Texas: Pig Road—New Waverly
 Utah: Mayflower Mountain Tailings Pond—Wasatch
 Washington: Quendall Terminal—Renton

Reproposed Sites

One site—the Pratt & Whitney Aircraft/United Technologies Corp. Site in West Palm Beach, Florida—has been reproposed for the NPL. The site was originally proposed for the NPL on October 15, 1984 (40 FR 40320). The Agency reproposed the site on September 18, 1985 (50 FR 37950), and solicited comments on a completely revised HRS score. The Agency is considering comments received on this site and will make a decision whether to include it on the NPL in a future rulemaking.

Sites Still Under Consideration

The Agency has not made a final decision for 88 sites, including 36 Federal facilities sites and 31 RCRA-related sites (Table 3); eighty-three of these sites will continue to be proposed. The basis for continuing the proposal of these sites is explained below or in section IV of the eligibility policies. In a separate notice in today's *Federal Register*, EPA is soliciting further comments on five sites.

Table 3.—Sites Still Under Consideration

Category Site Name, and Location

Proposed Sites: Comment Period Not Extended

Federal Facilities:

Alabama Army Ammunition Plant—Childersburg, Alabama
 Anniston Army Depot (Southeast Industrial Area)—Anniston, Alabama
 Castle Air Force Base—Merced, California

Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (USDOE)—Livermore, California
 Mather Air Force Base (AC&W Disposal Site)—Sacramento, California
 McClellan Air Force Base (Ground Water Contamination)—Sacramento, California
 Norton Air Force Base—San Bernardino, California
 Sacramento Army Depot—Sacramento, California
 Sharpe Army Depot—Lathrop, California
 Rocky Flats Plant (USDOE)—Golden, Colorado
 Rocky Mountain Arsenal—Adams County, Colorado
 Dover Air Force Base—Dover, Delaware
 Robins Air Force Base—Houston County, Georgia
 Joliet Army Ammunition Plant (Manufacturing Area)—Joliet, Illinois
 Sangamo Electric Dump/Crab Orchard National Wildlife Refuge (USDOI)—Carterville, Illinois
 Savanna Army Depot Activity—Savanna, Illinois
 Louisiana Army Ammunition Plant—Doyline, Louisiana
 Brunswick Naval Air Station—Brunswick, Maine
 Lake City Army Ammunition Plant (Northwest Lagoon)—Independence, Missouri
 Weldon Spring Quarry (USDOE/Army)—St. Charles County, Missouri
 Cornhusker Army Ammunition Plant—Hall County, Nebraska
 Fort Dix (Landfill Site)—Burlington County, New Jersey
 Naval Weapons Station Earle (Site A)—Colts Neck, New Jersey
 Griffiss Air Force Base—Rome, New York
 Umatilla Army Depot (Lagoons)—Hermiston, Oregon
 Letterkenny Army Depot (Southeast Area)—Chambersburg, Pennsylvania
 Milan Army Ammunition Plant—Milan, Tennessee
 Air Force Plant #4 (General Dynamics)—Fort Worth, Texas
 Lone Star Army Ammunition Plant—Texarkana, Texas
 Hill Air Force Base—Ogden, Utah
 Ogden Defense Depot—Ogden, Utah
 Tooele Army Depot (North Area)—Tooele, Utah
 Defense General Supply Center—Chesterfield County, Virginia
 Bangor Ordnance Disposal—Bremerton, Washington
 Fort Lewis (Landfill #5)—Tacoma, Washington

McChord Air Force Base (Wash Rack/Treatment Area)—Tacoma, Washington

Pesticide-Application Sites:

Kunia Wells I—Oahu, Hawaii
Kunia Wells II—Oahu, Hawaii
Mililani Wells—Oahu, Hawaii
Waiala Shaft—Oahu, Hawaii
Waipahu Wells—Oahu, Hawaii
Waipio Heights Wells II—Oahu, Hawaii

RCRA-Related Sites:

Motorola, Inc. (52nd Street Plant)—Phoenix, Arizona
Applied Materials—Santa Clara, California
Fairchild Camera & Instrument Corp. (Mountain View Plant)—Mountain View, California
Fairchild Camera & Instrument Corp. (South San Jose Plant)—South San Jose, California
FMC Corp. (Fresno Plant)—Fresno, California
Hewlett-Packard—Palo Alto, California
IBM Corp. (San Jose Plant)—San Jose, California
Lorentz Barrel & Drum Co.—San Jose, California
Marley Cooling Tower Co.—Stockton, California
Monolithic Memories, Inc.—Sunnyvale, California
National Semiconductor Corp.—Santa Clara, California
Rhone-Poulenc, Inc./Zoecon Corp.—East Palo Alto, California
Signetics, Inc.—Sunnyvale, California
Southern Pacific Transportation Co.—Roseville, California
Teledyne Semiconductor—Mountain View, California
Van Waters & Rogers, Inc.—San Jose, California
City Industries, Inc.—Orlando, Florida
Olin Corp. (Areas 1, 2 & 4)—Augusta, Georgia
Sheffield (U.S. Ecology, Inc.)—Sheffield, Illinois
Chemplex Co.—Clinton/Camanche, Iowa
U.S. Nameplate Co.—Mount Vernon, Iowa
National Industrial Environmental Services—Furley, Kansas
E.I. DuPont de Nemours & Co., Inc. (Montague Plant)—Montague, Michigan
Lacks Industries, Inc.—Grand Rapids, Michigan
Findett Corp.—St. Charles, Missouri
Burlington Northern Railroad (Somers Tie-Treating Plant)—Somers, Montana
Lindsay Manufacturing Co.—Lindsay, Nebraska
General Electric Co. (Coshocton Plant)—Coshocton, Ohio
Culpeper Wood Preservers, Inc.—Culpeper County, Virginia
IBM Corp. (Manassas Plant Spill)—Manassas, Virginia
Moby Chemical Corp. (New Martinsville Plant)—New Martinsville, West Virginia

Mining Waste Sites:

Olson/Neihart Reservoir—Wasatch County, Utah
Sharon Steel Corp. (Midvale Tailings)—Midvale, Utah

Other Sites:

J.H. Baxter Co.—Weed, California
Montrose Chemical Corp.—Torrance, California

Montco Research Products, Inc.—Hollister, Florida

Michigan Disposal Service (Cork Street Landfill)—Kalamazoo, Michigan
Quail Run Mobile Manor—Gray Summit, Missouri

Lodi Municipal Well—Lodi, New Jersey
Brio Refining Co., Inc.—Friendswood, Texas

Sol Lynn/Industrial Transformers—Houston, Texas

Proposed Sites: Comment Period Extended

Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. (Salinas Plant)—Salinas, California
Kerr-McGee (Kress/Creek/West Branch of DuPage River)—DuPage County, Illinois
Kerr-McGee (Reed-Keppeler Park)—West Chicago, Illinois
Kerr-McGee (Residential Areas)—West Chicago/DuPage County, Illinois
Kerr-McGee (Sewage Treatment Plant)—West Chicago, Illinois

Montrose Chemical Corp., Torrance, California. The Montrose Chemical Corp. Site in Torrance, California, was part of the October 15, 1984 (49 FR 40320) proposal. EPA is deferring final rulemaking on this site until additional air monitoring is completed. The site was scored with an observed release of DDT to the air based on the presence of DDT in several soil samples surrounding the site. The Agency believes that additional sampling may confirm an air release from this site.

Quail Run Mobile Manor Site, Gray Summit, Missouri. The Agency has not made a final decision on the promulgation of the Quail Run Mobile Manor Site in Gray Summit, Missouri, at this time. The site was originally proposed in Update #1 (48 FR 40674, September 8, 1983) on the basis of a proposed health advisory listing criterion, rather than on an HRS score of 28.50 or above. This proposed listing criterion was subsequently promulgated (50 FR 37624, September 16, 1985) as Section 300.66(b)(4) of the NCP. The Agency is continuing to evaluate this site. Accordingly, EPA is deferring final rulemaking on the Quail Run Site at this time.

Other Sites. EPA has received additional technical information for six sites—the J.H. Baxter Co. Site in Weed, California; Montco Research Products Inc., Site in Hollister, Florida; Michigan Disposal Service (Cork Street Landfill) Site in Kalamazoo, Michigan; Lodi Municipal Well in Lodi, New Jersey; the Brio Refining Co. Site in Friendswood, Texas; and the Sol Lynn/Industrial Transformer Site in Houston, Texas. In order to further evaluate this information, the Agency has decided to defer final rulemaking on these six sites. They will remain in proposed status until a later rulemaking.

Name Revisions

A number of changes are being made in the site names in the October 1984 proposal, some in response to information received during the comment period (Table 4). The changes are intended to reflect more accurately the location or nature of the problems at the site, or to give each site a unique name.

The following site, placed on the NPI in October 1984, is also being renamed:

- American Creosote Works in Pensacola, Florida, becomes American Creosote Works, Inc. (Pensacola Plant).

Table 4.—Changes in Site Names

Site Name on Proposed NPL and Site Name on Final NPL

California:

Alviso Dumping Areas, Alviso—South Bay Asbestos Area
Thompson-Hayward Chemical Co., Fresno—T.H. Agriculture & Nutrition Co.
Zeocon Corp./Rhone-Poulenc, Inc., East Palo Alto—Rhone-Poulenc, Inc./Zeocon Corp.

Minnesota: Pine Bend Sanitary Landfill/
Crosby American Demolition Landfill,
Dakota County—Pine Bend Sanitary Landfill

Pennsylvania: Domino Salvage Yard, Valley Township—MW Manufacturing
Tennessee: American Creosote Works, Inc., Jackson—American Creosote Works Inc. (Jackson Plant)

Utah: Sharon Steel Corp. (Midvale Smelter)—
Sharon Steel Corp. (Midvale Tailings)

Wisconsin: Lemberger Fly Ash Landfill,
Whitelaw—Lemberger Landfill, Inc.

Comments on Sites Not Proposed

EPA received comments on a few sites that were not proposed as candidates for the NPL. These sites include: Kesterson Wildlife Refuge, Los Banos, California; Prewitt Refinery, Prewitt, New Mexico; Lake Erie (Ashtabula North Shore), Ashtabula, Ohio; and Buckingham County Landfill, Buckingham Courthouse, Virginia.

In response, EPA updates the NPL using rulemaking procedures established pursuant to the Administrative Procedure Act. One of these sites, Buckingham Courthouse, Virginia has been proposed for the NPL in the April 10, 1985, update to the NPL (50 FR 14115) as Love's Container Service Landfill. Since the rest of these sites have not been proposed for the NPL, they are not eligible for action in this final rule. EPA is working with the States to evaluate the hazards at these sites and determine the appropriateness of including them on the NPL.

VII. Deletions of Final Sites

There is no specific statutory requirement that the NPL be revised to

delete sites. However, EPA has decided to delete sites to provide incentives for cleanup to private parties and public agencies. Furthermore, deleting sites allows the Agency to drive notice that the sites have been cleaned up and gives the public an opportunity to comment on those actions. Section 300.66(c)(7) of the NCP establishes criteria for deleting sites from the NPL. Under § 300.66(c)(7), a site may be deleted where no further response is appropriate. In making this determination, EPA will consider whether any of the following criteria has been met:

(1) EPA in consultation with the State has determined that responsible or other parties have implemented all appropriate response actions required;

(2) All appropriate Fund-financed response under CERCLA has been implemented, and EPA, in consultation with the State, has determined that no further cleanup by responsible parties is appropriate; or

(3) Based on remedial investigation, EPA, in consultation with the State, has determined that the release poses no significant threat to public health or the environment, and therefore, remedial measures as not appropriate.

Sites that have been deleted from the NPL remain eligible for further Fund-

financed remedial actions if future conditions warrant such action.

The criteria and procedures for deleting sites from the NPL were outlined initially in a guidance memorandum dated March 27, 1984. EPA solicited comments on the deletion criteria and procedures when EPA proposed the second update to the NPL (49 FR 40322, October 15, 1985). EPA again solicited comments when the NCP amendments were proposed (50 FR 5862, February 12, 1985). The November 20, 1985, promulgation of amendments to the NCP reflects EPA's consideration of all the comments received on the criteria for deletion of sites on the NPL (50 FR 47912).

On December 31, 1985 (50 FR 53448), EPA published a notice of intent to delete eight sites from the NPL. EPA accepted comments on the deletion of these sites and published a notice on March 7, 1986 (51 FR 7935) indicating that the following sites have been deleted from the NPL:

- Taputimu Farm, Island of Tutuila, American Samoa
- PCB Warehouse, Saipan, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands
- Morris Arsenic Dump, Morris, Minnesota

- Friedman Property (once listed as Upper Freehold Township), Upper Freehold Township, New Jersey

- -PCB Spills, 243 Miles of Road, North Carolina

- -Enterprise Avenue, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

- -Lehigh Electric & Engineering Co., Old Forge Borough, Pennsylvania

- -PCB Wastes, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands

VIII. Contents of the NPL

CERCLA requires that the NPL include, if practicable, at least 400 sites. The NCP amendment published today contains a total of 703 entries, including 170 new sites. The 170 sites added to the final list are shown in Table 5 by rank. Each entry contains the name of the facility, the State and city or county in which it is located, and the corresponding EPA Region. For informational purposes, each entry is accompanied by a notation on the current status of response and cleanup activities at the site. The definitions of the response categories and cleanup status codes are described more fully below.

BILLING CODE 6560-50-M

TABLE 5
NATIONAL PRIORITIES LIST (BY RANK)
SITES ADDED IN MAY 1986

| NPL RANK | EPA RG | ST | SITE NAME * | CITY/COUNTY | RESPONSE CATEGORY# | CLEANUP STATUS@ |
|-------------|-----------|----|-----------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| GROUP 2 | | | | | | |
| 54 | 04 | FL | Peak Oil Co./Bay Drum Co. | Tampa | R | |
| 68 | 05 | IN | International Minerals (E. Plant) | Terre Haute | | D |
| 71 | 09 | CA | Operating Industries, Inc. | Lndfll Monterey Park | F | |
| GROUP 3 | | | | | | |
| 112 | 08 | UT | Portland Cement (Kiln Dust 2 & 3) | Salt Lake City | V | S |
| 117 | 10 | WA | Midway Landfill | Kent | R | I |
| 128 | 06 | TX | Bailey Waste Disposal | Bridge City | R | |
| 131 | 05 | MI | Thermo-Chem, Inc. | Muskegon | | D |
| 140 | 05 | MN | Pine Bend Sanitary Landfill | Dakota County | S | |
| 141 | 07 | IA | Lawrence Todtz Farm | Camanche | | D |
| GROUP 4 | | | | | | |
| 159 | 05 | OH | Industrial Excess Landfill | Uniontown | R | S |
| 163 | 02 | NY | Liberty Industrial Finishing | Farmingdale | V | S |
| 181 | 04 | NC | Celanese(Shelby Fiber Operations) | Shelby | | D |
| 184 | 05 | MI | Motor Wheel, Inc. | Lansing | | D |
| 186 | 06 | TX | Stewco, Inc. | Waskom | R | F |
| 192 | 02 | NY | Johnstown City Landfill | Town of Johnstown | | D |
| 193 | 04 | NC | NC State U (Lot 86, Farm Unit #1) | Raleigh | | D |
| 196 | 03 | PA | Hunterstown Road | Straban Township | R | F |
| GROUP 5 | | | | | | |
| 213 | 08 | CO | Eagle Mine | Minturn/Redcliff | R | S |
| 219 | 07 | MO | Lee Chemical | Liberty | | D |
| 223 | 05 | MI | Torch Lake | Houghton County | | D |
| 224 | 01 | RI | Central Landfill | Johnston | V | F |
| 228 | 03 | PA | MW Manufacturing | Valley Township | | S |
| 233 | 03 | PA | Whitmoyer Laboratories | Jackson Township | | D |

*: STATES' DESIGNATED TOP PRIORITY SITES

#: V = VOLUNTARY OR NEGOTIATED RESPONSE; R = FEDERAL AND STATE RESPONSE;
F = FEDERAL ENFORCEMENT; S = STATE ENFORCEMENT;
D = ACTIONS TO BE DETERMINED.

@: I = IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITY UNDERWAY, ONE OR MORE OPERABLE UNITS;
O = ONE OR MORE OPERABLE UNITS COMPLETED, OTHERS MAY BE UNDERWAY;
C = IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITY COMPLETED FOR ALL OPERABLE UNITS.

NATIONAL PRIORITIES LIST (BY RANK)
SITES ADDED IN MAY 1986

| NPL RANK | EPA RG | ST | SITE NAME * | CITY/COUNTY | RESPONSE CATEGORY# | CLEANUP STATUS@ |
|-------------|-----------|----|-------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
|-------------|-----------|----|-------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------------------|

GROUP 5 (CON'T)

| | | | | | | |
|-----|----|----|-----------------------------------|------------------|-----|---|
| 235 | 03 | PA | Shriver's Corner | Straban Township | R F | 0 |
| 239 | 05 | IL | Pagel's Pit | Rockford | | 0 |
| 240 | 05 | MN | U of Minnesota Rosemount Res Cent | Rosemount | S | |
| 241 | 05 | MN | Freeway Sanitary Landfill | Burnsville | | D |
| 245 | 04 | MS | Newsom Brothers/Old Reichhold | Columbia | R | 0 |
| 250 | 05 | IN | Columbus Old Municipal Lndfil #1 | Columbus | | D |

GROUP 6

| | | | | | | |
|-----|----|----|---------------------------------|--------------------|---------|---|
| 253 | 02 | NY | Tronic Plating Co., Inc. | Farmingdale | | D |
| 258 | 02 | NJ | Waldick Aerospace Devices, Inc. | Wall Township | R S | 0 |
| 263 | 09 | CA | South Bay Asbestos Area | Alviso | R | I |
| 274 | 10 | OR | Martin-Marietta Aluminum Co. | The Dalles | V | |
| 275 | 08 | CO | Uravan Uranium (Union Carbide) | Uravan | | D |
| 278 | 05 | MN | Oak Grove Sanitary Landfill | Oak Grove Township | R | |
| 287 | 05 | OH | AlSCO Anaconda | Gnadenhutten | | S |
| 292 | 04 | AL | Interstate Lead Co. (ILCO) | Leeds | V R F S | 0 |

GROUP 7

| | | | | | | |
|-----|----|----|-----------------------------------|----------------------|---|---|
| 305 | 05 | IN | Fort Wayne Reduction Dump | Fort Wayne | R | |
| 307 | 05 | WI | National Presto Industries, Inc. | Eau Claire | | D |
| 311 | 03 | MD | Mid-Atlantic Wood Preservers, Inc | Harmans | | D |
| 319 | 06 | TX | Odessa Chromium #1 | Odessa | R | |
| 320 | 06 | TX | Odessa Chromium #2 (Andrews Hgwy) | Odessa | R | |
| 321 | 07 | NE | Hastings Ground Water Contamin | Hastings | R | |
| 325 | 09 | CA | San Fernando Valley (Area 1) | Los Angeles | | D |
| 326 | 09 | CA | San Fernando Valley (Area 2) | Los Angeles/Glendale | | D |
| 327 | 09 | CA | San Fernando Valley (Area 3) | Glendale | | D |
| 328 | 09 | CA | T.H. Agriculture & Nutrition Co. | Fresno | | D |
| 332 | 04 | NC | Jadco-Hughes Facility | Belmont | | D |
| 333 | 02 | NJ | Monitor Devices/Intercircuits Inc | Wall Township | | D |
| 337 | 02 | NY | Hooker Chemical/Ruco Polymer Corp | Hicksville | | D |

*: STATES' DESIGNATED TOP PRIORITY SITES

#: V = VOLUNTARY OR NEGOTIATED RESPONSE; R = FEDERAL AND STATE RESPONSE;
F = FEDERAL ENFORCEMENT; S = STATE ENFORCEMENT;
D = ACTIONS TO BE DETERMINED.@: I = IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITY UNDERWAY, ONE OR MORE OPERABLE UNITS;
O = ONE OR MORE OPERABLE UNITS COMPLETED, OTHERS MAY BE UNDERWAY;
C = IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITY COMPLETED FOR ALL OPERABLE UNITS.

NATIONAL PRIORITIES LIST (BY RANK)
SITES ADDED IN MAY 1986

| NPL RANK | EPA RG | ST | SITE NAME * | CITY/COUNTY | RESPONSE CATEGORY# | CLEANUP STATUS@ |
|-----------------|-----------|----|-----------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| GROUP 7 (CON'T) | | | | | | |
| 340 | 02 | NY | Applied Environmental Services/ | Glenwood Landing | | |
| 342 | 01 | NH | Tibbets Road | Barrington | R S | I O |
| GROUP 8 | | | | | | |
| 352 | 05 | MI | Roto-Finish Co., Inc. | Kalamazoo | | |
| 353 | 05 | MN | Olmsted County Sanitary Landfill | Oronoco | | D O |
| 354 | 07 | MO | Quality Plating | Sikeston | | D |
| 362 | 10 | WA | Toftdahl Drums | Brush Prairie | | D |
| 363 | 06 | TX | Texarkana Wood Preserving Co. | Texarkana | R | O |
| 370 | 09 | CA | Westinghouse (Sunnyvale Plant) | Sunnyvale | | D |
| 373 | 05 | MI | H. Brown Co., Inc. | Grand Rapids | | D |
| 374 | 02 | NY | Nepera Chemical Co., Inc. | Maybrook | V | D |
| 380 | 02 | NY | Pasley Solvents & Chemicals, Inc. | Hempstead | | D |
| 387 | 01 | RI | Davis (GSR) Landfill | Glocester | | D |
| 391 | 06 | TX | South Cavalcade Street | Houston | V F | |
| 397 | 05 | IL | Petersen Sand & Gravel | Libertyville | R | |
| GROUP 9 | | | | | | |
| 401 | 08 | MT | Idaho Pole Co. | Bozeman | | D I |
| 406 | 05 | MN | Windom Dump | Windom | | D |
| 408 | 05 | IL | NL Industries/Taracorp Lead Smelt | Granite City | V F S | |
| 415 | 02 | NJ | Cinnaminson Ground Water Contamin | Cinnaminson Township | R | |
| 418 | 04 | NC | Bypass 601 Ground Water Contamin | Concord | | D |
| 419 | 07 | MO | Solid State Circuits, Inc. | Republic | R F S | O |
| 420 | 07 | NE | Waverly Ground Water Contamin | Waverly | R | |
| 421 | 09 | CA | Advanced Micro Devices, Inc. | Sunnyvale | | D |
| 432 | 03 | PA | Brown's Battery Breaking | Shoemakersville | R F | O |
| 433 | 02 | NY | SMS Instruments, Inc. | Deer Park | | D |
| 436 | 02 | NY | Byron Barrel & Drum | Byron | R F | O |
| 438 | 02 | NY | Anchor Chemicals | Hicksville | | D |
| 439 | 05 | MI | Waste Management-Mich (Holland) | Holland | | D |

*: STATES' DESIGNATED TOP PRIORITY SITES

#: V = VOLUNTARY OR NEGOTIATED RESPONSE; R = FEDERAL AND STATE RESPONSE;
F = FEDERAL ENFORCEMENT; S = STATE ENFORCEMENT;
D = ACTIONS TO BE DETERMINED.@: I = IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITY UNDERWAY, ONE OR MORE OPERABLE UNITS;
O = ONE OR MORE OPERABLE UNITS COMPLETED, OTHERS MAY BE UNDERWAY;
C = IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITY COMPLETED FOR ALL OPERABLE UNITS.

NATIONAL PRIORITIES LIST (BY RANK)
SITES ADDED IN MAY 1986

| NPL RANK | EPA RG | ST | SITE NAME * | CITY/COUNTY | RESPONSE CATEGORY# | CLEANUP STATUS@ |
|-------------|-----------|----|-------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
|-------------|-----------|----|-------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------------------|

GROUP 9 (CON'T)

440 06 TX North Cavalcade Street

Houston

R

GROUP 10

| | | | | | | |
|-----|----|----|-----------------------------------|---------------------|-----|-----|
| 456 | 05 | IN | Neal's Dump (Spencer) | Spencer | F S | 0 |
| 458 | 03 | PA | Westinghouse Elevator Co. Plant | Gettysburg | R F | 0 |
| 465 | 05 | WI | Stoughton City Landfill | Stoughton | | D 0 |
| 468 | 03 | PA | Middletown Air Field | Middletown | | D 0 |
| 473 | 03 | WV | Ordnance Works Disposal Areas | Morgantown | F | |
| 476 | 02 | NY | Suffern Village Well Field | Village of Suffern | R | |
| 477 | 02 | NY | Endicott Village Well Field | Village of Endicott | R | |
| 478 | 05 | MN | Kummer Sanitary Landfill | Bemidji | R | I |
| 479 | 05 | OH | Sanitary Landfill Company (IWD) | Dayton | | D |
| 481 | 07 | MO | Valley Park TCE | Valley Park | | D |
| 482 | 09 | CA | San Fernando Valley (Area 4) | Los Angeles | | D |
| 489 | 03 | VA | Avtex Fibers, Inc. | Front Royal | | D |
| 492 | 02 | NY | Katonah Municipal Well | Town of Bedford | R | 0 |
| 497 | 04 | TN | American Creosote (Jackson Plant) | Jackson | R | 0 |
| 500 | 02 | NY | Preferred Plating Corp. | Farmingdale | | D |

GROUP 11

| | | | | | | |
|-----|----|----|-----------------------------------|---------------------|---------|-----|
| 502 | 08 | UT | Monticello Rad Contaminated Props | Monticello | R | I |
| 505 | 01 | MA | Salem Acres | Salem | | D |
| 515 | 10 | WA | Mica Landfill | Mica | | D |
| 522 | 02 | NY | Clothier Disposal | Town of Granby | R | |
| 523 | 03 | PA | Ambler Asbestos Piles | Ambler | V R F S | 0 |
| 525 | 03 | VA | L.A. Clarke & Son | Spotsylvania County | R | |
| 527 | 03 | MD | Southern Maryland Wood Treating | Hollywood | R | 0 |
| 529 | 09 | CA | Beckman Instruments (Porterville) | Porterville | | D |
| 530 | 04 | FL | Dubose Oil Products Co. | Cantonment | | S 0 |
| 535 | 05 | WI | Lemberger Landfill, Inc. | Whitelaw | | S |
| 541 | 03 | PA | Modern Sanitation Landfill | Lower Windsor Twp | V | S |

*: STATES' DESIGNATED TOP PRIORITY SITES

#: V = VOLUNTARY OR NEGOTIATED RESPONSE; R = FEDERAL AND STATE RESPONSE;
F = FEDERAL ENFORCEMENT; S = STATE ENFORCEMENT;
D = ACTIONS TO BE DETERMINED.@: I = IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITY UNDERWAY, ONE OR MORE OPERABLE UNITS;
O = ONE OR MORE OPERABLE UNITS COMPLETED, OTHERS MAY BE UNDERWAY;
C = IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITY COMPLETED FOR ALL OPERABLE UNITS.

NATIONAL PRIORITIES LIST (BY RANK)
SITES ADDED IN MAY 1986

| NPL RANK | EPA RG | ST | SITE NAME * | CITY/COUNTY | RESPONSE CATEGORY# | CLEANUP STATUS@ |
|-------------|-----------|----|-------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
|-------------|-----------|----|-------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------------------|

GROUP 11 (CON'T)

| | | | | | | |
|-----|----|----|-------------------------------|-----------|---|---|
| 543 | 05 | MI | North Bronson Industrial Area | Bronson | | |
| 548 | 10 | WA | Northwest Transformer | Everson | R | D |
| 549 | 05 | WI | Sheboygan Harbor & River | Sheboygan | | O |

GROUP 12

| | | | | | | |
|-----|----|----|-----------------------------------|--------------------|---|-----|
| 552 | 02 | NY | North Sea Municipal Landfill | North Sea | R | |
| 554 | 09 | CA | Louisiana-Pacific Corp. | Oroville | | D |
| 555 | 05 | MI | South Macomb Disposal (Lf 9 & 9A) | Macomb Township | | D |
| 560 | 02 | NY | Hertel Landfill | Plattekill | | D |
| 561 | 02 | NY | Haviland Complex | Town of Hyde Park | R | |
| 562 | 05 | MN | Adrian Municipal Well Field | Adrian | R | |
| 564 | 07 | KS | Strother Field Industrial Park | Cowley County | V | S |
| 565 | 02 | NJ | Fried Industries | East Brunswick Twp | R | |
| 569 | 02 | NY | Goldisc Recordings, Inc. | Holbrook | V | |
| 572 | 02 | NY | Sarney Farm | Amenia | R | |
| 573 | 01 | MA | Rose Disposal Pit | Lanesboro | | F S |
| 574 | 05 | OH | Van Dale Junkyard | Marietta | | D |
| 577 | 02 | NY | Volney Municipal Landfill | Town of Volney | V | S |
| 578 | 02 | NY | FMC Corp. (Dublin Road Landfill) | Town of Shelby | V | S |
| 580 | 04 | KY | Smith's Farm | Brooks | R | |
| 582 | 07 | KS | Big River Sand Co. | Wichita | R | |
| 587 | 06 | TX | Crystal City Airport | Crystal City | R | |
| 592 | 02 | NY | Cortese Landfill | Vil of Narrowsburg | V | S |
| 596 | 07 | IA | Midwest Manufacturing/North Farm | Kellogg | | D |
| 600 | 02 | NJ | Pomona Oaks Residential Wells | Galloway Township | R | |

GROUP 13

| | | | | | | |
|-----|----|----|----------------------------------|--------------|---|---|
| 602 | 05 | MN | Long Prairie Ground Water Contam | Long Prairie | R | |
| 603 | 05 | MN | Waite Park Wells | Waite Park | R | |
| 604 | 09 | CA | Intel Magnetix | Santa Clara | | D |
| 605 | 09 | CA | Intel Corp. (Santa Clara III) | Santa Clara | | D |

*: STATES' DESIGNATED TOP PRIORITY SITES

#: V = VOLUNTARY OR NEGOTIATED RESPONSE; R = FEDERAL AND STATE RESPONSE;
F = FEDERAL ENFORCEMENT; S = STATE ENFORCEMENT;
D = ACTIONS TO BE DETERMINED.@: I = IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITY UNDERWAY, ONE OR MORE OPERABLE UNITS;
O = ONE OR MORE OPERABLE UNITS COMPLETED, OTHERS MAY BE UNDERWAY;
C = IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITY COMPLETED FOR ALL OPERABLE UNITS.

NATIONAL PRIORITIES LIST (BY RANK)
SITES ADDED IN MAY 1986

| NPL RANK | EPA RG | ST | SITE NAME * | CITY/COUNTY | RESPONSE CATEGORY# | CLEANUP STATUS@ |
|------------------|-----------|----|-----------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| GROUP 13 (CON'T) | | | | | | |
| 610 | 02 | NY | Kenmark Textile Corp. | Farmingdale | | D I |
| 612 | 04 | KY | Maxey Flats Nuclear Disposal | Hillsboro | R | |
| 613 | 08 | MT | Mouat Industries | Columbus | | D |
| 614 | 02 | NY | Claremont Polychemical | Old Bethpage | V S | |
| 616 | 03 | PA | Croydon TCE | Croydon | | D |
| 617 | 07 | IA | Vogel Paint & Wax Co. | Orange City | | S |
| 618 | 05 | MN | Kurt Manufacturing Co. | Fridley | | S |
| 620 | 06 | TX | Koppers Co., Inc. (Texarkana Plt) | Texarkana | V F | |
| 622 | 08 | CO | Smuggler Mountain | Pitkin County | V F | |
| 625 | 05 | MI | Avenue "E" Ground Water Contamin | Traverse City | | S |
| 629 | 05 | MN | Koch Refining Co./N-Ren Corp. | Pine Bend | V S | |
| 631 | 05 | WI | Fadowski Drum Disposal | Franklin | | D |
| 636 | 03 | DE | Halby Chemical Co. | New Castle | | D |
| 640 | 06 | AR | Midland Products | Ola/Birta | R | |
| 641 | 02 | NY | Robintech, Inc./National Pipe Co. | Town of Vestal | R | |
| 642 | 02 | NY | BEC Trucking | Town of Vestal | | D |
| 646 | 03 | VA | Rhinehart Tire Fire Dump | Frederick County | V R F | O |

GROUP 14

| | | | | | | |
|-----|----|----|-----------------------------------|--------------------|-------|-----|
| 654 | 01 | MA | Haverhill Municipal Landfill | Haverhill | | D |
| 657 | 02 | NY | Colesville Municipal Landfill | Town of Colesville | | D O |
| 658 | 04 | FL | Yellow Water Road Dump | Baldwin | R F | O |
| 661 | 05 | IN | MIDCO II | Gary | R F | O |
| 662 | 03 | MD | Kane & Lombard Street Drums | Baltimore | R | O |
| 664 | 10 | WA | Silver Mountain Mine | Loomis | R | O |
| 665 | 06 | TX | Petro-Chemical (Turtle Bayou) | Liberty County | R | |
| 666 | 05 | OH | Republic Steel Corp. Quarry | Elyria | | D |
| 668 | 09 | CA | Intel Corp. (Mountain View Plant) | Mountain View | F | |
| 669 | 09 | CA | Raytheon Corp. | Mountain View | F | I |
| 670 | 05 | MN | Agate Lake Scrapyard | Fairview Township | R | O |
| 672 | 01 | MA | Shpack Landfill | Norton/Attleboro | | D |
| 674 | 01 | MA | Norwood PCBs | Norwood | R | O |
| 678 | 05 | IN | Tri-State Plating | Columbus | | D |
| 680 | 01 | NH | Coakley Landfill | North Hampton | V R S | |

*: STATES' DESIGNATED TOP PRIORITY SITES

#: V = VOLUNTARY OR NEGOTIATED RESPONSE; R = FEDERAL AND STATE RESPONSE;
F = FEDERAL ENFORCEMENT; S = STATE ENFORCEMENT;
D = ACTIONS TO BE DETERMINED.@: I = IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITY UNDERWAY, ONE OR MORE OPERABLE UNITS;
O = ONE OR MORE OPERABLE UNITS COMPLETED, OTHERS MAY BE UNDERWAY;
C = IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITY COMPLETED FOR ALL OPERABLE UNITS.

NATIONAL PRIORITIES LIST (BY RANK)
SITES ADDED IN MAY 1986

| NPL RANK | EPA RG | ST | SITE NAME * | CITY/COUNTY | RESPONSE CATEGORY# | CLEANUP STATUS@ |
|-------------|-----------|----|-------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
|-------------|-----------|----|-------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------------------|

GROUP 14 (CON'T)

| | | | | | | |
|-----|----|----|-----------------------------------|----------------------|-----|---|
| 684 | 05 | WI | Wausau Ground Water Contamination | Wausau | R | 0 |
| 688 | 07 | MO | North-U Drive Well Contamination | Springfield | R | 0 |
| 693 | 10 | WA | Northside Landfill | Spokane | R | 0 |
| 694 | 06 | OK | Sand Springs Petrochemical Cmplx | Sand Springs | R F | 0 |
| 695 | 06 | TX | Pesses Chemical Co. | Fort Worth | R | 0 |
| 696 | 05 | MN | East Bethel Demolition Landfill | East Bethel Township | | D |

GROUP 15

| | | | | | | |
|-----|----|----|---------------------------|--------|--|---|
| 702 | 07 | MO | Bee Cee Manufacturing Co. | Malden | | D |
|-----|----|----|---------------------------|--------|--|---|

*: STATES' DESIGNATED TOP PRIORITY SITES

#: V = VOLUNTARY OR NEGOTIATED RESPONSE; R = FEDERAL AND STATE RESPONSE;
F = FEDERAL ENFORCEMENT; S = STATE ENFORCEMENT;
D = ACTIONS TO BE DETERMINED.@: I = IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITY UNDERWAY, ONE OR MORE OPERABLE UNITS;
O = ONE OR MORE OPERABLE UNITS COMPLETED, OTHERS MAY BE UNDERWAY;
C = IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITY COMPLETED FOR ALL OPERABLE UNITS.

NUMBER OF NPL SITES: 170

BILLING CODE 6560-50-C

The new sites added to the NPL are incorporated into the previously promulgated NPL in order of their HRS score (except where EPA modified the order to reflect top priorities designated by the States, as discussed in the following paragraph). The NPL is presented in groups of 50 sites to emphasize the fact that minor differences in HRS scores do not necessarily represent significantly different levels of risk. EPA considers the sites within a group to have approximately the same priority for response actions.

Section 105(b)(3) of CERCLA requires that, to the extent practicable, the NPL include within the 100 highest priorities at least one facility designated by each State as representing the greatest danger to public health, welfare, or the environment among known facilities in the State. Because States are not required to rely on the HRS in designating their top-priority sites, the HRS scores of some of these sites would not have placed them among the first 100. Consequently, these lower-scoring State priority sites are listed at the bottom of the first 100 sites. All top-priority sites designated by States are indicated by asterisks.

For informational purposes, the NPL includes several categories of notation reflecting the status of response and cleanup activities at these sites at the time this list was prepared. Because this information may change periodically, these notations may become outdated. The response categories and cleanup status codes are defined below:

Response Categories

The following response categories are used to designate the type of response underway. One or more categories may apply to each site.

Federal and/or State response (R). The Federal and/or State Response category includes sites at which EPA or State agencies have started or completed response actions. These include removal actions, non-enforcement remedial investigations/feasibility studies, initial remedial measures, and/or remedial actions under CERCLA [NCP, § 300.66(f)(1) 47 FR 31217, July 16, 1982]. For purposes of assigning a category, the response action commences when EPA obligates funds.

Federal enforcement (F). This category includes sites where the United States has filed a civil complaint (including cost recovery actions) or issued an administrative order under CERCLA or RCRA. It also includes sites at which a Federal court has mandated some form of response action following

a judicial proceeding. All sites at which EPA has obligated funds for enforcement-lead remedial investigations and feasibility studies also are included in this category.

A number of sites on the NPL are the subject of investigations or have been formally referred to the Department of Justice for possible enforcement action. EPA's policy is not to release information concerning a possible enforcement action until a lawsuit has been filed. Accordingly, sites subject to pending Federal action are not included in this category, but are included under "Category To Be Determined."

State enforcement (S). This category includes sites where a State has filed a civil complaint or issued an administrative order. It also includes sites at which a State court has mandated some form of response action following a judicial proceeding. Sites where a State has obligated funds for enforcement-lead remedial investigations and feasibility studies are also included in this category.

It is assumed that State policy is not to release information concerning possible enforcement actions until such action has been formally taken. Accordingly, sites subject to pending State legal action are not included in this category, but are included under "Category To Be Determined."

Voluntary or negotiated response (V). Sites are included in this category if private parties have started or completed response actions pursuant to consent agreements, consent orders or consent decrees to which EPA and/or the State is a party. Usually, the response actions result from a Federal or State enforcement action. This category includes privately-financed remedial investigations/feasibility studies, removal actions, initial remedial measures, and/or remedial actions.

Category to be determined (D). This category includes all sites not listed in any other category. A wide range of activities may be in progress at sites in this category. EPA or a State may be evaluating the type of response action to undertake, or a response action may be determined but funds are not yet obligated. A site where an enforcement action may be under development, or Federal or State legal action has been initiated under authorities other than CERCLA or RCRA are also included in this category. Responsible parties may be undertaking cleanup actions that are not covered by a consent decree, consent agreement, or an administrative order.

Cleanup Status Codes

EPA indicates the status of Fund-financed or private party cleanup activities underway or completed at NPL sites. Fund-financed response activities which are coded include: significant removal actions, initial remedial measures, source control remedial actions, and off-site remedial actions. The status of cleanup activities conducted by responsible parties under a consent decree, consent agreement, court order, or administrative order also is coded. Additionally coded are similar cleanup activities taken independently of EPA and/or the State. Remedial planning activities or engineering studies do not receive a cleanup status code.

Many sites listed on the NPL are cleaned up in stages or "operable units." For purposes of cleanup status coding, an operable unit is a discrete action taken as part of the entire site cleanup that significantly decreases or eliminates a release, threat of release, or pathway of exposure. One or more operable units may be necessary to complete the cleanup of a hazardous waste site. Operable units may include significant removal actions taken to stabilize deteriorating site conditions or provide alternative water supplies, initial remedial measures, and remedial actions. Simple removal actions such as building fences and berms which do not eliminate a significant release, threat of release, or pathway of exposure are not considered an operable unit for purposes of cleanup status coding.

The following cleanup status codes are used to designate the status of cleanup activities at NPL sites. Only one status code is necessary to denote the status of actual cleanup activity at each site since the codes are mutually exclusive.

Implementation activities are underway for one or more operable units (I). Field work is in progress at the site for implementation of one or more removal or remedial operable units, but no operable units are completed.

Implementation activities are completed for one or more (but not all) operable units. Implementation activities may be underway for additional operable units (O). Field work has been completed for one or more operable units, but additional site cleanup actions are necessary.

Implementation activities are completed for all operable units (C). The approved remedy has been implemented. All actions agreed upon for remedial action at the site have been completed, and performance monitoring

has commenced. The site will be considered for deletion from the NPL subsequent to completion of the performance monitoring and preparation of a deletion recommendation. Further site activities could occur if EPA considers such activities necessary.

IX. Regulatory Impact Analysis

The costs of cleanup actions that may be taken at sites are not directly attributable to listing on the NPL, as explained below. Therefore, the Agency has determined that this rulemaking is not a "major" regulation under Executive Order 12291. EPA has conducted a preliminary analysis of economic implications of today's amendment to the NCP. EPA believes that the kinds of economic effects associated with this revision are generally similar to those effects identified in the regulatory impact analysis (RIA) prepared in 1982 for the revisions to the NCP pursuant to section 105 of CERCLA and the economic analysis prepared when the amendments to the NCP were proposed (50 FR 5882, February 12, 1985). The Agency believes the anticipated economic effects related to adding 170 sites to the NPL can be characterized in terms of the conclusions of the earlier regulatory impact analysis and the most recent economic analysis.

Costs

EPA has determined that this rulemaking is not a "major" regulation under Executive Order 12291 because inclusion of a site on the NPL does not itself impose any costs. It does not establish that EPA will necessarily undertake remedial action, nor does it require any action by a private party or determine its liability for site response costs. Costs that arise out of site responses result from site-by-site decisions about what actions to take, not directly from the act of listing itself. Nonetheless, it is useful to consider the costs associated with responding to all sites included in this rulemaking.

Costs associated with responsible party searches are initially borne by EPA. Responsible parties may bear some or all the costs of the remedial investigation/feasibility study (RI/FS), design and construction, and operation and maintenance (O & M), or the costs may be shared by EPA and the States on a 90%:10% basis (50%:50% in the case of publicly-owned sites). Additionally, States assume all costs for O&M activities after the first year at sites involving Fund-financed remedial actions.

Rough estimates of the average per-site and total costs associated with each

of the above activities are presented below. At this time, EPA is unable to predict what portions of the total costs will be borne by responsible parties, since the distribution of costs depends on the extent of voluntary and negotiated response and the success of any cost recovery actions.

| Average total cost per site ¹ | |
|--|-------------|
| Cost category: | |
| RI/FS..... | \$800,000 |
| Remedial design..... | 440,000 |
| Remedial action..... | 2 7,200,000 |
| Net present value of O&M (over 30 yrs.) ³ | 2 3,770,000 |

¹ 1984 U.S. dollars.

² Includes State cost share.

³ Assumes cost of O&M over 30 years, \$400,000 for the first year, and 10% discount rate.

Source: "Extent of the Hazardous Release Problem and Future Funding Needs—CERCLA Section 301(a)(1)(c) Study", December 1984. Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response, U.S. EPA.

Costs to States associated with today's amendment arise from the required State costs-share of: (1) 10 percent of remedial action and 10 percent of first year O&M costs at privately-owned sites; and (2) at least 50 percent of the remedial planning (RI/FS and remedial design), remedial action and first year O&M costs at publicly-owned sites. States will assume all of the cost for O&M after the first year. Using the assumptions developed in the 1982 RIA for the NCP, EPA has assumed that 90 percent of the 170 sites added to the NPL in this amendment will be privately-owned and 10 percent will be State or locally-owned. Therefore, using the budget projections presented above, the cost to States of undertaking Federal remedial actions at all 170 sites would be \$764 million, of which \$582 million is attributable to the State O&M cost.

Listing a hazardous waste site on the final NPL does not itself cause firms responsible for the site to bear costs. Nonetheless, a listing may induce firms to clean up the sites voluntarily, or it may act as a potential trigger for subsequent enforcement or cost recovery actions. Such actions may impose costs on firms, but the decisions to take such actions are discretionary, and made on a case-by-case basis. Consequently, precise estimates of these effects cannot be made. EPA does not believe that every site will be cleaned up by a responsible party. EPA cannot project at this time which firms or industry sectors will bear specific portions of the response costs, but the Agency considers: the volume and nature of the wastes at the site; the strength of the evidence linking the wastes at the site to the parties; the parties' ability to pay; and other factors when deciding whether and how to

proceed against potentially responsible parties.

Economy-wide effects of this amendment are aggregations of effects on firms and State and local governments. Although effects could be felt by some individual firms and States, the total impact of this revision on output, prices, and employment is expected to be negligible at the national level, as was the case in the 1982 RIA.

Benefits

The real benefits associated with today's amendment to list additional sites on the NPL are increased health and environmental protection as a result of increased public awareness of potential hazards. In addition to the potential for more Federally-financed remedial actions, expansion of the NPL could accelerate privately-financed, voluntary cleanup efforts to avoid potential adverse publicity, private lawsuits, and/or Federal or State enforcement action. Listing sites as national priority targets may also give States increased support for funding responses at particular sites.

As a result of the additional NPL remedies, there will be lower human exposure to high risk chemicals, and higher quality surface water, ground water, soil, and air. The magnitude of these benefits is expected to be significant, although difficult to estimate in advance of completing the RI/FS at these sites.

Associated with the costs are significant potential benefits and cost offsets. The distributional costs to firms of financing NPL remedies have corresponding "benefits" in that funds expended for a response generate employment, directly or indirectly (through purchased materials).

X. Regulatory Flexibility Act Analysis

The Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 requires EPA to review the impacts of this action on small entities, or certify that the action will not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities. By small entities the Act refers to small businesses, small governmental jurisdictions, and nonprofit organizations.

While modifications to the NPL are considered revisions to the NCP, they are not typical regulatory changes since the revisions do not automatically impose costs. The listing of sites on the NPL does not in itself require any action of any private party, nor does it determine the liability of any party for the cost of cleanup at the site. Further, no identifiable groups are affected as a

whole. As a consequence, it is hard to predict impacts on any group. A site's inclusion on the NPL could increase the likelihood that adverse impacts to responsible parties (in the form of cleanup costs) will occur, but EPA cannot identify the potentially affected businesses at this time nor estimate the number of small businesses that might be affected.

The Agency does expect that certain industries and firms within industries that have caused a proportionately high percentage of waste site problems could be significantly affected by CERCLA actions. However, EPA does not expect the impacts from the listing of these 170 sites to have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small businesses.

In any case, economic impacts would only occur through enforcement and cost recovery actions which are taken at EPA's discretion on a site-by-site basis. EPA considers many factors when determining what enforcement actions to take, including not only the firm's contribution to the problem, but also the firm's ability to pay. The impacts (from cost recovery) on small governments and nonprofit organizations would be determined on a similar case-by-case basis.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 300

Air pollution control, Chemicals, Hazardous materials, Intergovernmental relations, Natural resources, Oil pollution, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Superfund, Waste

treatment and disposal, Water pollution control, Water supply.

PART 300—[AMENDED]

40 CFR Part 300 is amended to read as follows:

1. The authority citations for Part 300 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 9605(8)(B)/CERCLA 105(8)(B).

2. Appendix B of Part 300 is revised to read as set forth below.

Dated: May 19, 1986.

Jack W. McGraw,

Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response.

BILLING CODE 6560-50-M

Appendix B—National Priorities List (By Rank)

| NPL RANK | EPA RG | ST | SITE NAME * | CITY/COUNTY | RESPONSE CATEGORY# | CLEANUP STATUS@ |
|-------------|-----------|----|-----------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| GROUP 1 | | | | | | |
| 1 | 02 | NJ | Lipari Landfill | Pitman | R F | 0 |
| 2 | 03 | DE | Tybouts Corner Landfill * | New Castle County | V R F | 0 |
| 3 | 03 | PA | Bruin Lagoon | Bruin Borough | R | 0 |
| 4 | 02 | NJ | Helen Kramer Landfill | Mantua Township | R S | 0 |
| 5 | 01 | MA | Industri-Plex | Woburn | V R | 0 |
| 6 | 02 | NJ | Price Landfill * | Pleasantville | R F | 0 |
| 7 | 02 | NY | Pollution Abatement Services * | Oswego | R | 0 |
| 8 | 07 | IA | LaBounty Site | Charles City | V F | 0 |
| 9 | 03 | DE | Army Creek Landfill | New Castle County | V F | 0 |
| 10 | 02 | NJ | CPS/Madison Industries | Old Bridge Township | D | 0 |
| 11 | 01 | MA | Nyanza Chemical Waste Dump | Ashland | R | 0 |
| 12 | 02 | NJ | Gems Landfill | Gloucester Township | R S | 1 |
| 13 | 05 | MI | Berlin & Farro | Swartz Creek | V R F S | 0 |
| 14 | 01 | MA | Baird & McGuire | Holbrook | R F | 0 |
| 15 | 02 | NJ | Lone Pine Landfill | Freehold Township | V R F | 0 |
| 16 | 01 | NH | Somersworth Sanitary Landfill | Somersworth | R | 0 |
| 17 | 05 | MN | FMC Corp. (Fridley Plant) | Fridley | V | 0 |
| 18 | 06 | AR | Vertac, Inc. | Jacksonville | V F | 0 |
| 19 | 01 | NH | Keefe Environmental Services | Epping | R S | 0 |
| 20 | 08 | SD | Whitewood Creek * | Whitewood | V | 0 |
| 21 | 08 | MT | Silver Bow Creek | Sil Bow/Deer Lodge | R | 0 |
| 22 | 06 | TX | French, Ltd. | Crosby | V R F | 0 |
| 23 | 01 | NH | Sylvester * | Nashua | R S | 0 |
| 24 | 05 | MI | Liquid Disposal, Inc. | Utica | R | 0 |
| 25 | 03 | PA | Tysons Dump | Upper Merion Twp | R F | 0 |
| 26 | 03 | PA | McAdoo Associates * | McAdoo Borough | R | 0 |
| 27 | 06 | TX | Motco Inc. * | La Marque | R F | 0 |
| 28 | 05 | OH | Arcanum Iron & Metal | Darke County | R F | 0 |
| 29 | 08 | MT | East Helena Site | East Helena | V F | 0 |
| 30 | 06 | TX | Sikes Disposal Pits | Crosby | R | 0 |
| 31 | 04 | AL | Triana/Tennessee River | Limestone/Morgan | V R F | 0 |
| 32 | 09 | CA | Stringfellow * | Glen Avon Heights | R F | 0 |
| 33 | 01 | ME | McKin Co. | Gray | R F S | 0 |
| 34 | 06 | TX | Crystal Chemical Co. | Houston | R | 0 |
| 35 | 02 | NJ | Bridgeport Rental & Oil Services | Bridgeport | R | 0 |
| 36 | 08 | CO | Sand Creek Industrial | Commerce City | R F | 0 |
| 37 | 06 | TX | Geneva Industries/Fuhrmann Energy | Houston | R F | 0 |
| 38 | 01 | MA | W. R. Grace & Co. (Acton Plant) | Acton | V F S | 0 |
| 39 | 05 | MN | Reilly Tar (St. Louis Park Plant) | St. Louis Park | R F S | 0 |

*: STATES' DESIGNATED TOP PRIORITY SITES

#: V = VOLUNTARY OR NEGOTIATED RESPONSE; R = FEDERAL AND STATE RESPONSE;
 F = FEDERAL ENFORCEMENT; S = STATE ENFORCEMENT;
 D = ACTIONS TO BE DETERMINED.

@: I = IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITY UNDERWAY, ONE OR MORE OPERABLE UNITS;
 O = ONE OR MORE OPERABLE UNITS COMPLETED, OTHERS MAY BE UNDERWAY;
 C = IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITY COMPLETED FOR ALL OPERABLE UNITS.

NATIONAL PRIORITIES LIST (BY RANK)

| NPL RANK | EPA RG | ST | SITE NAME # | CITY/COUNTY | RESPONSE CATEGORY# | CLEANUP STATUS@ |
|-----------------|-----------|----|-------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| GROUP 1 (CON'T) | | | | | | |
| 40 | 02 | NJ | Burnt Fly Bog | Marlboro Township | R S | 0 |
| 41 | 02 | NJ | Vineland Chemical Co., Inc. | Vineland | V F | 0 |
| 42 | 04 | FL | Schuykill Metals Corp. | Plant City | D | 0 |
| 43 | 05 | MN | New Brighton/Arden Hills | New Brighton | V R | 0 |
| 44 | 02 | NY | Old Bethpage Landfill | Oyster Bay | V S | 0 |
| 45 | 02 | NJ | Shieldalloy Corp. | Newfield Borough | V S | 0 |
| 46 | 04 | FL | Reeves SE Galvanizing Corp. | Tampa | D | 0 |
| 47 | 08 | MT | Anaconda Co. Smelter | Anaconda | V F | 1 |
| 48 | 10 | WA | Western Processing Co., Inc. | Kent | V R F S | 0 |
| 49 | 05 | WI | Omega Hills North Landfill | Germantown | S | 0 |
| 50 | 04 | FL | American Creosote (Pensacola) | Pensacola | R F | 0 |

GROUP 2

| | | | | | | |
|----|----|----|-----------------------------------|---------------------|-------|---|
| 51 | 02 | NJ | Caldwell Trucking Co. | Fairfield | R S | |
| 52 | 02 | NY | GE Moreau | South Glen Falls | V F S | 0 |
| 53 | 05 | IN | Seymour Recycling Corp. # | Seymour | V R F | 0 |
| 54 | 04 | FL | Peak Oil Co./Bay Drum Co. | Tampa | R | |
| 55 | 05 | OH | United Scrap Lead Co., Inc. | Troy | R | 0 |
| 56 | 06 | OK | Tar Creek (Ottawa County) | Ottawa County | R | 0 |
| 57 | 07 | KS | Cherokee County | Cherokee County | R | 1 |
| 58 | 02 | NJ | Brick Township Landfill | Brick Township | V S | |
| 59 | 05 | MI | Northern Plating | Cadillac | R | 0 |
| 60 | 05 | WI | Janesville Old Landfill | Janesville | F | |
| 61 | 10 | WA | Frontier Hard Chrome, Inc. | Vancouver | R | |
| 62 | 04 | SC | Independent Nail Co. | Beaufort | R | |
| 63 | 04 | SC | Kalama Specialty Chemicals | Beaufort | S | |
| 64 | 05 | WI | Janesville Ash Beds | Janesville | F | |
| 65 | 04 | FL | Davie Landfill | Davie | D | |
| 66 | 05 | OH | Miami County Incinerator | Troy | F | |
| 67 | 04 | FL | Gold Coast Oil Corp. | Miami | D | 0 |
| 68 | 05 | IN | International Minerals (E. Plant) | Terre Haute | D | |
| 69 | 05 | WI | Wheeler Pit | La Prairie Township | S | |
| 70 | 09 | AZ | Tucson Intl Airport Area | Tucson | R | |
| 71 | 09 | CA | Operating Industries, Inc. Lndfil | Monterey Park | F | |
| 72 | 02 | NY | Wide Beach Development | Brant | R | 0 |

*: STATES' DESIGNATED TOP PRIORITY SITES

#: V = VOLUNTARY OR NEGOTIATED RESPONSE; R = FEDERAL AND STATE RESPONSE;
F = FEDERAL ENFORCEMENT; S = STATE ENFORCEMENT;
D = ACTIONS TO BE DETERMINED.@: I = IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITY UNDERWAY, ONE OR MORE OPERABLE UNITS;
O = ONE OR MORE OPERABLE UNITS COMPLETED, OTHERS MAY BE UNDERWAY;
C = IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITY COMPLETED FOR ALL OPERABLE UNITS.

NATIONAL PRIORITIES LIST (BY RANK)

| NPL RANK | EPA RG | ST | SITE NAME * | CITY/COUNTY | RESPONSE CATEGORY# | CLEANUP STATUS@ |
|-------------|-----------|----|-------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
|-------------|-----------|----|-------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------------------|

GROUP 2 (CON'T)

| | | | | | | |
|-----|----|----|-----------------------------------|-------------------|---------|-------|
| 73 | 09 | CA | Iron Mountain Mine | Redding | R | |
| 74 | 02 | NJ | Scientific Chemical Processing | Carlstadt | V | F S 0 |
| 75 | 08 | CO | California Gulch | Leadville | | F |
| 76 | 02 | NJ | D'Imperio Property | Hamilton Township | R | |
| 77 | 05 | MN | Oakdale Dump | Oakdale | V | 0 |
| 78 | 05 | MI | Gratiot County Landfill * | St. Louis | V R F S | 0 |
| 79 | 01 | RI | Picillo Farm * | Coventry | R F S | 0 |
| 80 | 01 | MA | New Bedford Site * | New Bedford | V R F S | 0 |
| 81 | 06 | LA | Old Inger Oil Refinery * | Darrow | R | 1 |
| 82 | 05 | OH | Chem-Dyne * | Hamilton | V R F S | 0 |
| 83 | 04 | SC | SCRDI Bluff Road * | Columbia | V R F | 0 |
| 84 | 01 | CT | Laurel Park, Inc. * | Naugatuck Borough | V | S |
| 85 | 08 | CO | Marshall Landfill * | Boulder County | | F 0 |
| 86 | 05 | IL | Outboard Marine Corp. * | Waukegan | R F | |
| 87 | 06 | NM | South Valley * | Albuquerque | V R F | 1 |
| 88 | 01 | VT | Pine Street Canal * | Burlington | | D |
| 89 | 03 | WV | West Virginia Ordnance * | Point Pleasant | | F 0 |
| 90 | 07 | MO | Ellisville Site * | Ellisville | R F S | 0 |
| 91 | 08 | ND | Arsenic Trioxide Site * | Southeastern N.D. | R | 1 |
| 92 | 03 | VA | Matthews Electroplating * | Roanoke County | R | 0 |
| 93 | 07 | IA | Aidex Corp. * | Council Bluffs | R | 0 |
| 94 | 09 | AZ | Mountain View Mobile Home Estates | Globe | R F | C |
| 95 | 04 | TN | North Hollywood Dump * | Memphis | V R S | 0 |
| 96 | 04 | KY | A.L. Taylor (Valley of Drums) * | Brooks | R F | 0 |
| 97 | 09 | GU | Ordot Landfill * | Guam | R | |
| 98 | 04 | MS | Flowood Site * | Flowood | V | |
| 99 | 08 | UT | Rose Park Sludge Pit * | Salt Lake City | V | C |
| 100 | 07 | KS | Arkansas City Dump * | Arkansas City | R | |

GROUP 3

| | | | | | | |
|-----|----|----|---------------------------------|---------------|-----|-----|
| 101 | 05 | IL | A & F Material Reclaiming, Inc. | Greenup | | F 0 |
| 102 | 03 | PA | Douglassville Disposal | Douglassville | R | |
| 103 | 02 | NJ | Krysowaty Farm | Hillsborough | R | 0 |
| 104 | 05 | MN | Koppers Coke | St. Paul | V | S |
| 105 | 01 | MA | Plymouth Harbor/Cannon Engrng | Plymouth | V R | S 0 |

*: STATES' DESIGNATED TOP PRIORITY SITES

#: V = VOLUNTARY OR NEGOTIATED RESPONSE; R = FEDERAL AND STATE RESPONSE;
F = FEDERAL ENFORCEMENT; S = STATE ENFORCEMENT;
D = ACTIONS TO BE DETERMINED.@: I = IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITY UNDERWAY, ONE OR MORE OPERABLE UNITS;
O = ONE OR MORE OPERABLE UNITS COMPLETED, OTHERS MAY BE UNDERWAY;
C = IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITY COMPLETED FOR ALL OPERABLE UNITS.

NATIONAL PRIORITIES LIST (BY RANK)

| NPL RANK | EPA RG | ST | SITE NAME * | CITY/COUNTY | RESPONSE CATEGORY# | CLEANUP STATUS@ |
|-----------------|-----------|----|-----------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| GROUP 3 (CON'T) | | | | | | |
| 106 | 10 | ID | Bunker Hill Mining & Metallurg | Smelterville | F S | |
| 107 | 02 | NY | Hudson River PCBs | Hudson River | R | I |
| 108 | 02 | NJ | Universal Oil Products (Chem Div) | East Rutherford | V F S | |
| 109 | 09 | CA | Aerojet General Corp. | Rancho Cordova | F | I |
| 110 | 10 | WA | Com Bay, South Tacoma Channel | Tacoma | V R F S | 0 |
| 111 | 03 | PA | Osborne Landfill | Grove City | V S | |
| 112 | 08 | UT | Portland Cement (Kiln Dust 2 & 3) | Salt Lake City | V S | |
| 113 | 01 | CT | Old Southington Landfill | Southington | S | |
| 114 | 02 | NY | Syosset Landfill | Oyster Bay | | D |
| 115 | 09 | AZ | Nineteenth Avenue Landfill | Phoenix | S | |
| 116 | 10 | OR | Teledyne Wah Chang | Albany | | D |
| 117 | 10 | WA | Midway Landfill | Kent | R | I |
| 118 | 02 | NY | Sinclair Refinery | Wellsville | R | |
| 119 | 04 | AL | Mowbray Engineering Co. | Greenville | R | 0 |
| 120 | 05 | MI | Spiegelberg Landfill | Green Oak Township | R | 0 |
| 121 | 04 | FL | Miami Drum Services | Miami | R | 0 |
| 122 | 02 | NJ | Reich Farms | Pleasant Plains | R | |
| 123 | 10 | ID | Union Pacific Railroad Co. | Pocatello | | D |
| 124 | 02 | NJ | South Brunswick Landfill | South Brunswick | V F | 0 |
| 125 | 04 | AL | Ciba-Geigy Corp. (McIntosh Plant) | McIntosh | | D I |
| 126 | 04 | FL | Kassauf-Kimerling Battery | Tampa | V R F | |
| 127 | 05 | IL | Wauconda Sand & Gravel | Wauconda | R | |
| 128 | 06 | TX | Bailey Waste Disposal | Bridge City | R | |
| 129 | 01 | NH | Ottati & Goss/Kingston Steel Drum | Kingston | V R F S | 0 |
| 130 | 05 | MI | Ott/Story/Cordova | Dalton Township | R F | 0 |
| 131 | 05 | MI | Thermo-Chem, Inc. | Muskegon | | D |
| 132 | 02 | NJ | NL Industries | Pedricktown | | D |
| 133 | 05 | MN | St. Regis Paper Co. | Cass Lake | S | I |
| 134 | 02 | NJ | Ringwood Mines/Landfill | Ringwood Borough | V F | |
| 135 | 04 | FL | Whitehouse Oil Pits | Whitehouse | R | 0 |
| 136 | 04 | GA | Hercules 009 Landfill | Brunswick | | D |
| 137 | 05 | MI | Velsicol Chemical (Michigan) | St. Louis | V S | I |
| 138 | 05 | OH | Summit National | Deerfield Township | R | 0 |
| 139 | 02 | NY | Love Canal | Niagara Falls | R F S | 0 |
| 140 | 05 | MN | Pine Bend Sanitary Landfill | Dakota County | S | |
| 141 | 07 | IA | Lawrence Todtz Farm | Camanche | | D |
| 142 | 05 | IN | Fisher-Calo | LaPorte | F | |
| 143 | 04 | FL | Pioneer Sand Co. | Warrington | R S | |

*: STATES' DESIGNATED TOP PRIORITY SITES

#: V = VOLUNTARY OR NEGOTIATED RESPONSE; R = FEDERAL AND STATE RESPONSE;
F = FEDERAL ENFORCEMENT; S = STATE ENFORCEMENT;
D = ACTIONS TO BE DETERMINED.@: I = IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITY UNDERWAY, ONE OR MORE OPERABLE UNITS;
O = ONE OR MORE OPERABLE UNITS COMPLETED, OTHERS MAY BE UNDERWAY;
C = IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITY COMPLETED FOR ALL OPERABLE UNITS.

NATIONAL PRIORITIES LIST (BY RANK)

| NPL RANK | EPA RC | ST | SITE NAME * | CITY/COUNTY | RESPONSE CATEGORY# | CLEANUP STATUS@ |
|-------------|-----------|----|-------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
|-------------|-----------|----|-------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------------------|

GROUP 3 (CON'T)

| | | | | | | |
|-----|----|----|--------------------------------|------------------|---|-----|
| 144 | 05 | MI | Springfield Township Dump | Davisburg | R | |
| 145 | 03 | PA | Hranica Landfill | Buffalo Township | | D 0 |
| 146 | 04 | NC | Martin Marietta, Sodyeco, Inc. | Charlotte | V | |
| 147 | 04 | FL | Zellwood Ground Water Contam | Zellwood | | F |
| 148 | 05 | MI | Packaging Corp. of America | Filer City | V | F |
| 149 | 05 | WI | Muskego Sanitary Landfill | Muskego | | F |
| 150 | 02 | NY | Hooker (S Area) | Niagara Falls | | F S |

GROUP 4

| | | | | | | |
|-----|----|----|-----------------------------------|---------------------|---------|-----|
| 151 | 03 | PA | Lindane Dump | Harrison Township | | D 0 |
| 152 | 08 | CO | Central City-Clear Creek | Idaho Springs | R | |
| 153 | 02 | NJ | Ventron/Velsicol | Wood Ridge Borough | V R | S |
| 154 | 04 | FL | Taylor Road Landfill | Seffner | V | F 0 |
| 155 | 01 | RI | Western Sand & Gravel | Burrillville | R | S 0 |
| 156 | 04 | SC | Koppers Co., Inc (Florence Plant) | Florence | | S |
| 157 | 02 | NJ | Maywood Chemical Co. | Maywood/Rochelle Pk | R | 0 |
| 158 | 02 | NJ | Nascolite Corp. | Millville | R | |
| 159 | 05 | OH | Industrial Excess Landfill | Uniontown | R | S 1 |
| 160 | 06 | OK | Hardage/Griner | Criner | | F |
| 161 | 05 | MI | Rose Township Dump | Rose Township | R | |
| 162 | 05 | MN | Waste Disposal Engineering | Andover | V R F S | |
| 163 | 02 | NY | Liberty Industrial Finishing | Farmingdale | V | S |
| 164 | 02 | NJ | Kin-Buc Landfill | Edison Township | V R F | 0 |
| 165 | 05 | OH | Bowers Landfill | Circleville | V | F |
| 166 | 02 | NJ | Ciba-Geigy Corp. | Toms River | V | F |
| 167 | 05 | MI | Butterworth #2 Landfill | Grand Rapids | | F |
| 168 | 02 | NJ | American Cyanamid Co. | Bound Brook | V | S |
| 169 | 03 | PA | Heleva Landfill | North Whitehall Twp | V R F | 0 |
| 170 | 02 | NJ | Ewan Property | Shamong Township | R | |
| 171 | 02 | NY | Batavia Landfill | Batavia | V | F |
| 172 | 05 | MN | Boise Cascade/Onan/Medtronics | Fridley | | S 0 |
| 173 | 01 | RI | L&RR, Inc. | North Smithfield | | S |
| 174 | 04 | FL | NW 58th Street Landfill | Hialeah | R | |
| 175 | 02 | NJ | Delilah Road | Egg Harbor Township | R | |
| 176 | 03 | PA | Mill Creek Dump | Erie | R | 0 |

*: STATES' DESIGNATED TOP PRIORITY SITES

#: V = VOLUNTARY OR NEGOTIATED RESPONSE; R = FEDERAL AND STATE RESPONSE;
F = FEDERAL ENFORCEMENT; S = STATE ENFORCEMENT;
D = ACTIONS TO BE DETERMINED.@: I = IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITY UNDERWAY, ONE OR MORE OPERABLE UNITS;
O = ONE OR MORE OPERABLE UNITS COMPLETED, OTHERS MAY BE UNDERWAY;
C = IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITY COMPLETED FOR ALL OPERABLE UNITS.

NATIONAL PRIORITIES LIST (BY RANK)

| NPL RANK | EPA RG | ST | SITE NAME * | CITY/COUNTY | RESPONSE CATEGORY# | CLEANUP STATUS@ |
|----------------|-----------|----|-----------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| GROUP 4 (CONT) | | | | | | |
| 177 | 02 | NJ | Glen Ridge Radium Site | Glen Ridge | R | 0 |
| 178 | 02 | NJ | Montclair/West Orange Radium Site | Montclair/W Orange | R | 0 |
| 179 | 04 | FL | Sixty-Second Street Dump | Tampa | R | |
| 180 | 05 | MI | G&H Landfill | Utica | R | |
| 181 | 04 | NC | Celanese(Shelby Fiber Operations) | Shelby | | D |
| 182 | 02 | NJ | Metaltec/Aerosystems | Franklin Borough | R | |
| 183 | 05 | WI | Schmalz Dump | Harrison | R | |
| 184 | 05 | MI | Motor Wheel, Inc. | Lansing | | D |
| 185 | 02 | NJ | Lang Property | Pemberton Township | F | |
| 186 | 06 | TX | Stewco, Inc. | Waskom | R F | 0 |
| 187 | 02 | NJ | Sharkey Landfill | Parsippany Troy Hls | R | |
| 188 | 09 | CA | Selma Treating Co. | Selma | F | |
| 189 | 06 | LA | Cleve Reber | Sorrento | V R | I |
| 190 | 05 | IL | Velsicol Chemical (Illinois) | Marshall | R | C |
| 191 | 05 | MI | Tar Lake | Mancelona Township | F | |
| 192 | 02 | NY | Johnstown City Landfill | Town of Johnstown | | D |
| 193 | 04 | NC | NC State U (Lot 86, Farm Unit #1) | Raleigh | | D |
| 194 | 08 | CO | Lowry Landfill | Arapahoe County | V R | 0 |
| 195 | 05 | MN | MacGillis & Gibbs/Bell Lumber | New Brighton | R S | I |
| 196 | 03 | PA | Hunterstown Road | Straban Township | R F | 0 |
| 197 | 02 | NJ | Combe Fill North Landfill | Mount Olive Twp | R | |
| 198 | 01 | MA | Re-Solve, Inc. | Dartmouth | R F | I |
| 199 | 02 | NJ | Goose Farm | Plumstead Township | V R F S | 0 |
| 200 | 04 | TN | Velsicol Chem (Hardeman County) | Toone | | D |

GROUP 5

| | | | | | | |
|-----|----|----|----------------------------------|-------------------|-----|---|
| 201 | 02 | NY | York Oil Co. | Moina | R F | 0 |
| 202 | 04 | FL | Sapp Battery Salvage | Cottdale | R | 0 |
| 203 | 04 | SC | Wamchem, Inc. | Burton | | D |
| 204 | 02 | NJ | Chemical Leaman Tank Lines, Inc. | Bridgeport | V F | |
| 205 | 05 | WI | Master Disposal Service Landfill | Brookfield | R | |
| 206 | 07 | KS | Doepke Disposal Site (Holliday) | Johnson County | R | |
| 207 | 02 | NJ | Florence Land Recontouring LF | Florence Township | R | |
| 208 | 01 | RI | Davis Liquid Waste | Smithfield | R S | 0 |
| 209 | 01 | MA | Charles-George Reclamation Lf | Tyngsborough | R F | 0 |

*: STATES' DESIGNATED TOP PRIORITY SITES

#: V = VOLUNTARY OR NEGOTIATED RESPONSE; R = FEDERAL AND STATE RESPONSE;
F = FEDERAL ENFORCEMENT; S = STATE ENFORCEMENT;
D = ACTIONS TO BE DETERMINED.@: I = IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITY UNDERWAY, ONE OR MORE OPERABLE UNITS;
O = ONE OR MORE OPERABLE UNITS COMPLETED, OTHERS MAY BE UNDERWAY;
C = IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITY COMPLETED FOR ALL OPERABLE UNITS.

NATIONAL PRIORITIES LIST (BY RANK)

| NPL RANK | EPA RG | ST | SITE NAME * | CITY/COUNTY | RESPONSE CATEGORY# | CLEANUP STATUS@ |
|-----------------|-----------|----|-----------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| GROUP 5 (CON'T) | | | | | | |
| 210 | 02 | NJ | King of Prussia | Winslow Township | V F | |
| 211 | 03 | VA | Chisman Creek | York County | R | |
| 212 | 05 | OH | Nease Chemical | Salem | V S | I |
| 213 | 08 | CO | Eagle Mine | Minturn/Redcliff | R S | 0 |
| 214 | 02 | NJ | W. R. Grace & Co. (Wayne Plant) | Wayne Township | R | 0 |
| 215 | 02 | NJ | Chemical Control | Elizabeth | R S | 0 |
| 216 | 04 | SC | Leonard Chemical Co., Inc. | Rock Hill | S | 0 |
| 217 | 05 | OH | Allied Chemical & Ironton Coke | Ironton | R F | I |
| 218 | 05 | MI | Verona Well Field | Battle Creek | R | I |
| 219 | 07 | MO | Lee Chemical | Liberty | | D 0 |
| 220 | 01 | CT | Beacon Heights Landfill | Beacon Falls | R | |
| 221 | 04 | AL | Stauffer Chem (Cold Creek Plant) | Bucks | V | |
| 222 | 05 | MN | Burlington Northern (Brainerd) | Brainerd/Baxter | V | 0 |
| 223 | 05 | MI | Torch Lake | Houghton County | | D |
| 224 | 01 | RI | Central Landfill | Johnston | V F S | |
| 225 | 03 | PA | Malvern TCE | Malvern | | D 0 |
| 226 | 02 | NY | Facet Enterprises, Inc. | Elmira | V F | |
| 227 | 03 | DE | Delaware Sand & Gravel Landfill | New Castle County | R | 0 |
| 228 | 03 | PA | MW Manufacturing | Valley Township | | S |
| 229 | 04 | TN | Murray-Ohio Dump | Lawrenceburg | V S | |
| 230 | 05 | IN | Envirochem Corp. | Zionsville | V R F | 0 |
| 231 | 05 | IN | MIDCO I | Gary | F | 0 |
| 232 | 05 | OH | South Point Plant | South Point | F | I |
| 233 | 03 | PA | Whitmoyer Laboratories | Jackson Township | | D |
| 234 | 04 | FL | Coleman-Evans Wood Preserving Co. | Whitehouse | R F S | 0 |
| 235 | 03 | PA | Shriver's Corner | Straban Township | R F | 0 |
| 236 | 03 | PA | Dorney Road Landfill | Upper Macungie Twp | R | |
| 237 | 05 | IN | Northside Sanitary Landfill, Inc | Zionsville | F S | |
| 238 | 04 | FL | Florida Steel Corp. | Indiantown | V | 0 |
| 239 | 05 | IL | Pagel's Pit | Rockford | | D 0 |
| 240 | 05 | MN | U of Minnesota Rosemount Res Cent | Rosemount | | S |
| 241 | 05 | MN | Freeway Sanitary Landfill | Burnsville | | D |
| 242 | 09 | AZ | Litchfield Airport Area | Goodyear/Avondale | F | |
| 243 | 02 | NJ | Spence Farm | Plumstead Township | V R S | I |
| 244 | 06 | AR | Mid-South Wood Products | Mena | F | |
| 245 | 04 | MS | Newsom Brothers/Old Reichhold | Columbia | R | 0 |
| 246 | 09 | CA | Atlas Asbestos Mine | Fresno County | R | |
| 247 | 09 | CA | Coalinga Asbestos Mine | Coalinga | R | |

*: STATES' DESIGNATED TOP PRIORITY SITES

#: V = VOLUNTARY OR NEGOTIATED RESPONSE; R = FEDERAL AND STATE RESPONSE;
F = FEDERAL ENFORCEMENT; S = STATE ENFORCEMENT;
D = ACTIONS TO BE DETERMINED.@: I = IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITY UNDERWAY, ONE OR MORE OPERABLE UNITS;
O = ONE OR MORE OPERABLE UNITS COMPLETED, OTHERS MAY BE UNDERWAY;
C = IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITY COMPLETED FOR ALL OPERABLE UNITS.

NATIONAL PRIORITIES LIST (BY RANK)

| NPL RANK | EPA RG | ST | SITE NAME * | CITY/COUNTY | RESPONSE CATEGORY# | CLEANUP STATUS@ |
|-------------|-----------|----|-------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
|-------------|-----------|----|-------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------------------|

GROUP 5 (CON'T)

| | | | | | | |
|-----|----|----|----------------------------------|-----------------|-----|---|
| 248 | 04 | FL | Brown Wood Preserving | Live Oak | V F | |
| 249 | 02 | NY | Port Washington Landfill | Port Washington | R | 0 |
| 250 | 05 | IN | Columbus Old Municipal Lndfil #1 | Columbus | | D |

GROUP 6

| | | | | | | |
|-----|----|----|-----------------------------------|----------------------|-------|---|
| 251 | 02 | NJ | Combe Fill South Landfill | Chester Township | R | |
| 252 | 02 | NJ | JIS Landfill | Jamesburg/S. Brnswck | | S |
| 253 | 02 | NY | Tronic Plating Co., Inc. | Farmingdale | | D |
| 254 | 03 | PA | Centre County Kepone | State College Boro | | S |
| 255 | 05 | OH | Fields Brook | Ashtabula | R | I |
| 256 | 01 | CT | Solvents Recovery Service | Southington | | F |
| 257 | 08 | CO | Woodbury Chemical Co. | Commerce City | R | |
| 258 | 02 | NJ | Waldick Aerospace Devices, Inc. | Wall Township | R | S |
| 259 | 01 | MA | Hocomonco Pond | Westborough | R | |
| 260 | 04 | KY | Distler Brickyard | West Point | R F | 0 |
| 261 | 02 | NY | Ramapo Landfill | Ramapo | V | S |
| 262 | 09 | CA | Coast Wood Preserving | Ukiah | | S |
| 263 | 09 | CA | South Bay Asbestos Area | Alviso | R | |
| 264 | 02 | NY | Mercury Refining, Inc. | Colonie | V | S |
| 265 | 04 | FL | Hollingsworth Solderless Terminal | Fort Lauderdale | R | |
| 266 | 02 | NY | Olean Well Field | Olean | V R F | 0 |
| 267 | 04 | FL | Varsol Spill | Miami | R | |
| 268 | 05 | MN | Joslyn Manufacturing & Supply Co. | Brooklyn Center | V | S |
| 269 | 08 | CO | Denver Radium Site | Denver | R | I |
| 270 | 04 | FL | Tower Chemical Co. | Clermont | R F | 0 |
| 271 | 07 | MO | Syntex Facility | Verona | V | F |
| 272 | 08 | MT | Milltown Reservoir Sediments | Milltown | R | I |
| 273 | 05 | MN | Arrowhead Refinery Co. | Hermantown | R | I |
| 274 | 10 | OR | Martin-Marietta Aluminum Co. | The Dalles | V | |
| 275 | 08 | CO | Uravan Uranium (Union Carbide) | Uravan | | D |
| 276 | 02 | NJ | Pajak Farm | Plumstead Township | V R | S |
| 277 | 02 | NJ | Syncon Resins | South Kearny | R | 0 |
| 278 | 05 | MN | Oak Grove Sanitary Landfill | Oak Grove Township | R | |
| 279 | 09 | CA | Liquid Gold Oil Corp. | Richmond | | S |
| 280 | 09 | CA | Purity Oil Sales, Inc. | Malaga | R | 0 |

*: STATES' DESIGNATED TOP PRIORITY SITES

#: V = VOLUNTARY OR NEGOTIATED RESPONSE; R = FEDERAL AND STATE RESPONSE;
F = FEDERAL ENFORCEMENT; S = STATE ENFORCEMENT;
D = ACTIONS TO BE DETERMINED.@: I = IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITY UNDERWAY, ONE OR MORE OPERABLE UNITS;
O = ONE OR MORE OPERABLE UNITS COMPLETED, OTHERS MAY BE UNDERWAY;
C = IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITY COMPLETED FOR ALL OPERABLE UNITS.

NATIONAL PRIORITIES LIST (BY RANK)

| NPL RANK | EPA RG | ST | SITE NAME * | CITY/COUNTY | RESPONSE CATEGORY# | CLEANUP STATUS@ |
|-----------------|-----------|----|-------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| GROUP 6 (CON'T) | | | | | | |
| 281 | 01 | NH | Tinkham Garage | Londonderry | F S | 0 |
| 282 | 04 | FL | Alpha Chemical Corp. | Galloway | V | |
| 283 | 02 | NJ | Bog Creek Farm | Howell Township | R | |
| 284 | 01 | ME | Saco Tannery Waste Pits | Saco | R | 0 |
| 285 | 02 | PR | Frontera Creek | Rio Abajo | F | |
| 286 | 04 | FL | Pickettville Road Landfill | Jacksonville | V F | |
| 287 | 05 | OH | Alisco Anaconda | Gnadenhutten | S | |
| 288 | 01 | MA | Iron Horse Park | Billerica | R | 0 |
| 289 | 03 | PA | Palmerton Zinc Pile | Palmerton | V F | |
| 290 | 05 | IN | Neal's Landfill (Bloomington) | Bloomington | V F | |
| 291 | 05 | WI | Kohler Co. Landfill | Kohler | V | |
| 292 | 04 | AL | Interstate Lead Co. (ILCO) | Leeds | V R F S | 0 |
| 293 | 01 | MA | Silresim Chemical Corp. | Lowell | R S | 0 |
| 294 | 01 | MA | Wells G&H | Woburn | V F | |
| 295 | 02 | NJ | Chemsol, Inc. | Piscataway | V S | |
| 296 | 05 | WI | Lauer I Sanitary Landfill | Menomonee Falls | S | |
| 297 | 05 | MI | Petoskey Municipal Well Field | Petoskey | F | |
| 298 | 05 | MN | Union Scrap | Minneapolis | S | |
| 299 | 02 | NJ | Radiation Technology, Inc. | Rockaway Township | V S | |
| 300 | 02 | NJ | Fair Lawn Well Field | Fair Lawn | V S | |

GROUP 7

| | | | | | | |
|-----|----|----|-----------------------------------|-------------------|-----|---|
| 301 | 05 | IN | Main Street Well Field | Elkhart | R | |
| 302 | 05 | MN | Lehillier/Mankato Site | Lehillier/Mankato | R | 0 |
| 303 | 10 | WA | Lakewood Site | Lakewood | R | 0 |
| 304 | 03 | PA | Industrial Lane | Williams Township | F | |
| 305 | 05 | IN | Fort Wayne Reduction Dump | Fort Wayne | R | |
| 306 | 05 | WI | Onalaska Municipal Landfill | Onalaska | R | |
| 307 | 05 | WI | National Presto Industries, Inc. | Eau Claire | D | |
| 308 | 02 | NJ | Monroe Township Landfill | Monroe Township | V S | 0 |
| 309 | 02 | NJ | Rockaway Borough Well Field | Rockaway Township | R | |
| 310 | 05 | IN | Wayne Waste Oil | Columbia City | R F | |
| 311 | 03 | MD | Mid-Atlantic Wood Preservers, Inc | Harmans | D | |
| 312 | 10 | ID | Pacific Hide & Fur Recycling Co. | Pocatello | F | 0 |
| 313 | 07 | IA | Des Moines TCE | Des Moines | R | 1 |

*: STATES' DESIGNATED TOP PRIORITY SITES

#: V = VOLUNTARY OR NEGOTIATED RESPONSE; R = FEDERAL AND STATE RESPONSE;
F = FEDERAL ENFORCEMENT; S = STATE ENFORCEMENT;
D = ACTIONS TO BE DETERMINED.@: 1 = IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITY UNDERWAY, ONE OR MORE OPERABLE UNITS;
0 = ONE OR MORE OPERABLE UNITS COMPLETED, OTHERS MAY BE UNDERWAY;
C = IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITY COMPLETED FOR ALL OPERABLE UNITS.

NATIONAL PRIORITIES LIST (BY RANK)

| NPL RANK | EPA RG | ST | SITE NAME * | CITY/COUNTY | RESPONSE CATEGORY# | CLEANUP STATUS@ |
|-----------------|-----------|----|-----------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| GROUP 7 (CON'T) | | | | | | |
| 314 | 02 | NJ | Beachwood/Berkley Wells | Berkley Township | R | 0 |
| 315 | 02 | NY | Vestal Water Supply Well 4-2 | Vestal | V | S |
| 316 | 02 | PR | Vega Alta Public Supply Wells | Vega Alta | F | |
| 317 | 05 | MI | Sturgis Municipal Wells | Sturgis | R | |
| 318 | 05 | MN | Washington County Landfill | Lake Elmo | S | |
| 319 | 06 | TX | Odessa Chromium #1 | Odessa | R | |
| 320 | 06 | TX | Odessa Chromium #2 (Andrews Hwy) | Odessa | R | |
| 321 | 07 | NE | Hastings Ground Water Contamin | Hastings | R | |
| 322 | 09 | AZ | Indian Bend Wash Area | Scottsdale/Tempe | V | F |
| 323 | 09 | CA | San Gabriel Valley (Area 1) | El Monte | R | I |
| 324 | 09 | CA | San Gabriel Valley (Area 2) | Baldwin Park Area | R | |
| 325 | 09 | CA | San Fernando Valley (Area 1) | Los Angeles | | D |
| 326 | 09 | CA | San Fernando Valley (Area 2) | Los Angeles/Glendale | | D |
| 327 | 09 | CA | San Fernando Valley (Area 3) | Glendale | | D |
| 328 | 09 | CA | T.H. Agriculture & Nutrition Co. | Fresno | | D |
| 329 | 10 | WA | Com Bay, Near Shore/Tide Flats | Pierce County | R F S | |
| 330 | 05 | IL | LaSalle Electric Utilities | LaSalle | R | I |
| 331 | 05 | IL | Cross Brothers Pail (Pembroke) | Pembroke Township | R | I |
| 332 | 04 | NC | Jadco-Hughes Facility | Belmont | | D |
| 333 | 02 | NJ | Monitor Devices/Intercircuits Inc | Wall Township | | D |
| 334 | 02 | PR | Upjohn Facility | Barceloneta | | D |
| 335 | 09 | CA | McColl | Fullerton | R F | I |
| 336 | 03 | PA | Henderson Road | Upper Merion Twp | V | F |
| 337 | 02 | NY | Hooker Chemical/Ruco Polymer Corp | Hicksville | | D |
| 338 | 10 | WA | Colbert Landfill | Colbert | R | 0 |
| 339 | 06 | LA | Petro-Processors | Scotlandville | V | F |
| 340 | 02 | NY | Applied Environmental Services | Glenwood Landing | | S |
| 341 | 02 | PR | Barceloneta Landfill | Florida Afuera | | D |
| 342 | 01 | NH | Tibbets Road | Barrington | R | 0 |
| 343 | 03 | MD | Sand, Gravel & Stone | Elkton | V R F | 0 |
| 344 | 05 | MI | Spartan Chemical Co. | Wyoming | V | S |
| 345 | 02 | NJ | Roebling Steel Co. | Florence | R | |
| 346 | 03 | PA | East Mount Zion | Springettsbury Twp | R | |
| 347 | 04 | TN | Amnicola Dump | Chattanooga | R | |
| 348 | 02 | NJ | Vineland State School | Vineland | V | S |
| 349 | 01 | MA | Groveland Wells | Groveland | V R | S |
| 350 | 02 | NY | General Motors (Cent Foundry Div) | Massena | V | F |

*: STATES' DESIGNATED TOP PRIORITY SITES

#: V = VOLUNTARY OR NEGOTIATED RESPONSE; R = FEDERAL AND STATE RESPONSE;
F = FEDERAL ENFORCEMENT; S = STATE ENFORCEMENT;
D = ACTIONS TO BE DETERMINED.@: I = IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITY UNDERWAY, ONE OR MORE OPERABLE UNITS;
O = ONE OR MORE OPERABLE UNITS COMPLETED, OTHERS MAY BE UNDERWAY;
C = IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITY COMPLETED FOR ALL OPERABLE UNITS.

NATIONAL PRIORITIES LIST (BY RANK)

| NPL RANK | EPA RG | ST | SITE NAME * | CITY/COUNTY | RESPONSE CATEGORY# | CLEANUP STATUS@ |
|-------------|-----------|----|-----------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| GROUP 8 | | | | | | |
| 351 | 04 | SC | SCRDI Dixiana | Cayce | R F S | 0 |
| 352 | 05 | MI | Roto-Finish Co., Inc. | Kalamazoo | | D 0 |
| 353 | 05 | MN | Olmsted County Sanitary Landfill | Oronoco | | D 0 |
| 354 | 07 | MO | Quality Plating | Sikeston | | D 0 |
| 355 | 07 | MO | Fulbright Landfill | Springfield | | D 0 |
| 356 | 03 | PA | Presque Isle | Erie | R | |
| 357 | 02 | NJ | Williams Property | Swainton | R | |
| 358 | 02 | NJ | Renora, Inc. | Edison Township | V F | 0 |
| 359 | 02 | NJ | Denzer & Schafer X-Ray Co. | Bayville | V S | |
| 360 | 02 | NJ | Hercules, Inc. (Gibbstown Plant) | Gibbstown | | D 0 |
| 361 | 05 | IN | Ninth Avenue Dump | Gary | R | |
| 362 | 10 | WA | Toftdahl Drums | Brush Prairie | R | 0 |
| 363 | 06 | TX | Texarkana Wood Preserving Co. | Texarkana | | D 0 |
| 364 | 06 | AR | Gurley Pit | Edmondson | F | |
| 365 | 01 | RI | Peterson/Puritan, Inc. | Lincoln/Cumberland | | D 0 |
| 366 | 07 | MO | Times Beach Site | Times Beach | R | 0 |
| 367 | 05 | MI | Wash King Laundry | Pleasant Plains Twp | R | |
| 368 | 05 | MN | Whittaker Corp. | Minneapolis | | S 0 |
| 369 | 05 | MN | NL Industries/Taracorp/Golden | St. Louis Park | | S 1 |
| 370 | 09 | CA | Westinghouse (Sunnyvale Plant) | Sunnyvale | | D 0 |
| 371 | 01 | CT | Kellogg-Deering Well Field | Norwalk | R | |
| 372 | 01 | MA | Cannon Engineering Corp. (CEC) | Bridgewater | R S | |
| 373 | 05 | MI | H. Brown Co., Inc. | Grand Rapids | | D 0 |
| 374 | 02 | NY | Nepera Chemical Co., Inc. | Maybrook | V | |
| 375 | 02 | NY | Niagara County Refuse | Wheatfield | | D 0 |
| 376 | 04 | FL | Sherwood Medical Industries | Deland | | D 0 |
| 377 | 04 | AL | Olin Corp. (McIntosh Plant) | McIntosh | | D 0 |
| 378 | 05 | MI | Southwest Ottawa County Landfill | Park Township | V S | |
| 379 | 02 | NY | Kentucky Avenue Well Field | Horseheads | R | |
| 380 | 02 | NY | Pasley Solvents & Chemicals, Inc. | Hempstead | | D 0 |
| 381 | 02 | NJ | Asbestos Dump | Millington | V F | |
| 382 | 04 | KY | Lee's Lane Landfill | Louisville | V F | 0 |
| 383 | 06 | AR | Frit Industries | Walnut Ridge | V F | C |
| 384 | 05 | OH | Fultz Landfill | Jackson Township | R | I |
| 385 | 04 | FL | Tri-City Oil Conservationist, Inc | Tampa | R F | 0 |
| 386 | 05 | OH | Coshocton Landfill | Franklin Township | F | 0 |
| 387 | 01 | RI | Davis (CSR) Landfill | Glocester | | D 0 |
| 388 | 03 | PA | Lord-Shope Landfill | Girard Township | V S | 0 |

*: STATES' DESIGNATED TOP PRIORITY SITES

#: V = VOLUNTARY OR NEGOTIATED RESPONSE; R = FEDERAL AND STATE RESPONSE;
F = FEDERAL ENFORCEMENT; S = STATE ENFORCEMENT;
D = ACTIONS TO BE DETERMINED.@: I = IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITY UNDERWAY, ONE OR MORE OPERABLE UNITS;
O = ONE OR MORE OPERABLE UNITS COMPLETED, OTHERS MAY BE UNDERWAY;
C = IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITY COMPLETED FOR ALL OPERABLE UNITS.

NATIONAL PRIORITIES LIST (BY RANK)

| NPL RANK | EPA RG | ST | SITE NAME * | CITY/COUNTY | RESPONSE CATEGORY# | CLEANUP STATUS@ |
|-----------------|-----------|----|-------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| GROUP 8 (CON'T) | | | | | | |
| 389 | 10 | WA | FMC Corp. (Yakima Pit) | Yakima | S | |
| 390 | 05 | WI | Northern Engraving Co. | Sparta | V F | |
| 391 | 06 | TX | South Cavalcade Street | Houston | V F | |
| 392 | 01 | MA | PSC Resources | Palmer | S | 0 |
| 393 | 05 | MI | Forest Waste Products | Otisville | R F | |
| 394 | 03 | PA | Drake Chemical | Lock Haven | R | 0 |
| 395 | 01 | NH | Kearsarge Metallurgical Corp. | Conway | S | |
| 396 | 04 | SC | Palmetto Wood Preserving | Dixiana | R | 0 |
| 397 | 05 | IL | Petersen Sand & Gravel | Libertyville | R | |
| 398 | 05 | MI | Clare Water Supply | Clare | R F | |
| 399 | 03 | PA | Havertown PCP | Haverford | F | 0 |
| 400 | 03 | DE | New Castle Spill | New Castle County | D | |

GROUP 9

| | | | | | | |
|-----|----|----|-----------------------------------|----------------------|-------|---|
| 401 | 08 | MT | Idaho Pole Co. | Bozeman | D | I |
| 402 | 05 | IN | Lake Sandy Jo (M&M Landfill) | Gary | R | |
| 403 | 05 | IL | Johns-Manville Corp. | Waukegan | F | |
| 404 | 05 | MI | Chem Central | Wyoming Township | S | |
| 405 | 05 | MI | Novaco Industries | Temperance | R | |
| 406 | 05 | MN | Windom Dump | Windom | D | |
| 407 | 02 | NJ | Jackson Township Landfill | Jackson Township | D | 0 |
| 408 | 05 | IL | NL Industries/Taracorp Lead Smelt | Granite City | V F S | |
| 409 | 05 | MI | K&L Avenue Landfill | Oshkosh Township | F | |
| 410 | 10 | WA | Kaiser Aluminum Mead Works | Mead | V | |
| 411 | 05 | MN | Perham Arsenic Site | Perham | R | 0 |
| 412 | 05 | MI | Charlevoix Municipal Well | Charlevoix | R | I |
| 413 | 02 | NJ | Montgomery Township Housing Dev | Montgomery Township | R | |
| 414 | 02 | NJ | Rocky Hill Municipal Well | Rocky Hill Borough | R | |
| 415 | 02 | NJ | Cinnaminson Ground Water Contamin | Cinnaminson Township | R | |
| 416 | 02 | NY | Brewster Well Field | Putnam County | R | |
| 417 | 02 | NY | Vestal Water Supply Well 1-1 | Vestal | R | |
| 418 | 04 | NC | Bypass 601 Ground Water Contamin | Concord | D | |
| 419 | 07 | MO | Solid State Circuits, Inc. | Republic | R F S | 0 |
| 420 | 07 | NE | Waverly Ground Water Contamin | Waverly | R | |
| 421 | 09 | CA | Advanced Micro Devices, Inc. | Sunnyvale | D | |

*: STATES' DESIGNATED TOP PRIORITY SITES

#: V = VOLUNTARY OR NEGOTIATED RESPONSE; R = FEDERAL AND STATE RESPONSE;
F = FEDERAL ENFORCEMENT; S = STATE ENFORCEMENT;
D = ACTIONS TO BE DETERMINED.@: I = IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITY UNDERWAY, ONE OR MORE OPERABLE UNITS;
O = ONE OR MORE OPERABLE UNITS COMPLETED, OTHERS MAY BE UNDERWAY;
C = IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITY COMPLETED FOR ALL OPERABLE UNITS.

NATIONAL PRIORITIES LIST (BY RANK)

| NPL RANK | EPA RG | ST | SITE NAME * | CITY/COUNTY | RESPONSE CATEGORY# | CLEANUP STATUS@ |
|-----------------|-----------|----|-----------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| GROUP 9 (CON'T) | | | | | | |
| 422 | 05 | MN | Nutting Truck & Caster Co. | Faribault | S | |
| 423 | 02 | NJ | U.S. Radium Corp. | Orange | R | |
| 424 | 06 | TX | Highlands Acid Pit | Highlands | R | |
| 425 | 03 | PA | Resin Disposal | Jefferson Borough | D | 0 |
| 426 | 08 | MT | Libby Ground Water Contamination | Libby | F | |
| 427 | 04 | KY | Newport Dump | Newport | R | |
| 428 | 03 | PA | Moyers Landfill | Eagleview | R | |
| 429 | 04 | FL | Parramore Surplus | Mount Pleasant | D | |
| 430 | 01 | NH | Savage Municipal Water Supply | Milford | F | |
| 431 | 05 | IN | Poor Farm | Hancock County | R F | 0 |
| 432 | 03 | PA | Brown's Battery Breaking | Shoemakersville | R F | 0 |
| 433 | 02 | NY | SMS Instruments, Inc. | Deer Park | D | |
| 434 | 05 | MI | Hedblum Industries | Oscoda | F | |
| 435 | 06 | TX | United Creosoting Co. | Conroe | R F | 0 |
| 436 | 02 | NY | Byron Barrel & Drum | Byron | R F | 0 |
| 437 | 08 | WY | Baxter/Union Pacific Tie Treating | Laramie | V F S | 0 |
| 438 | 02 | NY | Anchor Chemicals | Hicksville | D | |
| 439 | 05 | MI | Waste Management-Mich (Holland) | Holland | D | |
| 440 | 06 | TX | North Cavalcade Street | Houston | R | |
| 441 | 02 | NJ | Sayreville Landfill | Sayreville | D | |
| 442 | 01 | NH | Dover Municipal Landfill | Dover | R | |
| 443 | 02 | NY | Ludlow Sand & Gravel | Clayville | V | S |
| 444 | 05 | WI | City Disposal Corp. Landfill | Dunn | F S | |
| 445 | 02 | NJ | Tabernacle Drum Dump | Tabernacle Township | V R F | 0 |
| 446 | 02 | NJ | Cooper Road | Voorhees Township | V | S |
| 447 | 07 | MO | Minker/Stout/Romaine Creek | Imperial | R | 0 |
| 448 | 01 | CT | Yaworski Waste Lagoon | Canterbury | R | S |
| 449 | 03 | WV | Leetown Pesticide | Leetown | R | 0 |
| 450 | 04 | FL | Cabot/Koppers | Gainesville | R | S |

GROUP 10

| | | | | | | |
|-----|----|----|----------------------------------|---------------------|-------|---|
| 451 | 02 | NJ | Evor Phillips Leasing | Old Bridge Township | R | |
| 452 | 03 | PA | Wade (ABM) | Chester | R F S | 0 |
| 453 | 03 | PA | Lackawanna Refuse | Old Forge Borough | R | 0 |
| 454 | 06 | OK | Compass Industries (Avery Drive) | Tulsa | R | |

*: STATES' DESIGNATED TOP PRIORITY SITES

#: V = VOLUNTARY OR NEGOTIATED RESPONSE; R = FEDERAL AND STATE RESPONSE;
F = FEDERAL ENFORCEMENT; S = STATE ENFORCEMENT;
D = ACTIONS TO BE DETERMINED.@: I = IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITY UNDERWAY, ONE OR MORE OPERABLE UNITS;
O = ONE OR MORE OPERABLE UNITS COMPLETED, OTHERS MAY BE UNDERWAY;
C = IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITY COMPLETED FOR ALL OPERABLE UNITS.

NATIONAL PRIORITIES LIST (BY RANK)

| NPL RANK | EPA RG | ST | SITE NAME * | CITY/COUNTY | RESPONSE CATEGORY# | CLEANUP STATUS@ |
|-------------|-----------|----|-------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
|-------------|-----------|----|-------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------------------|

GROUP 10 (CON'T)

| | | | | | | |
|-----|----|----|-----------------------------------|---------------------|---------|---|
| 455 | 02 | NJ | Mannheim Avenue Dump | Galloway Township | V F | I |
| 456 | 05 | IN | Neal's Dump (Spencer) | Spencer | F S | 0 |
| 457 | 02 | NY | Fulton Terminals | Fulton | R | |
| 458 | 03 | PA | Westinghouse Elevator Co. Plant | Gettysburg | R F | 0 |
| 459 | 01 | NH | Auburn Road Landfill | Londonderry | F S | |
| 460 | 03 | WV | Fike Chemical, Inc. | Nitro | F | 0 |
| 461 | 05 | MN | General Mills/Henkel Corp. | Minneapolis | S | |
| 462 | 05 | OH | Laskin/Poplar Oil Co. | Jefferson Township | V R F | 0 |
| 463 | 05 | OH | Old Mill | Rock Creek | R | 0 |
| 464 | 07 | KS | Johns' Sludge Pond | Wichita | V F | I |
| 465 | 05 | WI | Stoughton City Landfill | Stoughton | D | |
| 466 | 09 | CA | Del Norte Pesticide Storage | Crescent City | R | |
| 467 | 02 | NJ | De Rewal Chemical Co. | Kingwood Township | F | |
| 468 | 03 | PA | Middletown Air Field | Middletown | D | 0 |
| 469 | 02 | NJ | Swope Oil & Chemical Co. | Pennsauken | V R F | 0 |
| 470 | 04 | GA | Monsanto Corp. (Augusta Plant) | Augusta | V | 0 |
| 471 | 01 | NH | South Municipal Water Supply Well | Peterborough | F S | |
| 472 | 01 | ME | Winthrop Landfill | Winthrop | V F S | 0 |
| 473 | 03 | WV | Ordnance Works Disposal Areas | Morgantown | F | |
| 474 | 06 | AR | Cecil Lindsey | Newport | R | I |
| 475 | 05 | OH | Zanesville Well Field | Zanesville | V S | |
| 476 | 02 | NY | Suffern Village Well Field | Village of Suffern | R | |
| 477 | 02 | NY | Endicott Village Well Field | Village of Endicott | R | |
| 478 | 05 | MN | Kummer Sanitary Landfill | Bemidji | R | I |
| 479 | 05 | OH | Sanitary Landfill Company (IWD) | Dayton | D | |
| 480 | 05 | WI | Eau Claire Municipal Well Field | Eau Claire | R | |
| 481 | 07 | MO | Valley Park TCE | Valley Park | D | |
| 482 | 09 | CA | San Fernando Valley (Area 4) | Los Angeles | D | |
| 483 | 04 | CA | Powersville Site | Peach County | R | |
| 484 | 05 | MI | Grand Traverse Overall Supply Co. | Greilickville | F | |
| 485 | 05 | MI | Metamora Landfill | Metamora | R | I |
| 486 | 05 | MI | Whitehall Municipal Wells | Whitehall | R | |
| 487 | 05 | MN | South Andover Site | Andover | R | 0 |
| 488 | 02 | NJ | Diamond Alkali Co. | Newark | V R F S | 0 |
| 489 | 03 | VA | Avtex Fibers, Inc. | Front Royal | D | |
| 490 | 05 | MI | Kentwood Landfill | Kentwood | V F | |
| 491 | 05 | MI | Electrovoice | Buchanan | D | |
| 492 | 02 | NY | Katonah Municipal Well | Town of Bedford | R | 0 |

*: STATES' DESIGNATED TOP PRIORITY SITES

#: V = VOLUNTARY OR NEGOTIATED RESPONSE; R = FEDERAL AND STATE RESPONSE;
 F = FEDERAL ENFORCEMENT; S = STATE ENFORCEMENT;
 D = ACTIONS TO BE DETERMINED.

@: I = IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITY UNDERWAY, ONE OR MORE OPERABLE UNITS;
 O = ONE OR MORE OPERABLE UNITS COMPLETED, OTHERS MAY BE UNDERWAY;
 C = IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITY COMPLETED FOR ALL OPERABLE UNITS.

NATIONAL PRIORITIES LIST (BY RANK)

| NPL RANK | EPA RG | ST | SITE NAME * | CITY/COUNTY | RESPONSE CATEGORY# | CLEANUP STATUS@ |
|------------------|-----------|----|-----------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| GROUP 10 (CON'T) | | | | | | |
| 493 | 02 | PR | Fibers Public Supply Wells | Jobos | | D |
| 494 | 05 | IN | Marion (Bragg) Dump | Marion | R | |
| 495 | 05 | OH | Pristine, Inc. | Reading | R F | I |
| 496 | 05 | WI | Mid-State Disposal, Inc. Landfill | Cleveland Township | R | |
| 497 | 04 | TN | American Creosote (Jackson Plant) | Jackson | R | O |
| 498 | 08 | CO | Broderick Wood Products | Denver | V F | |
| 499 | 05 | OH | Buckeye Reclamation | St. Clairsville | V F | I |
| 500 | 02 | NY | Preferred Plating Corp. | Farmingdale | | D |
| GROUP 11 | | | | | | |
| 501 | 06 | TX | Bio-Ecology Systems, Inc. | Grand Prairie | R | O |
| 502 | 08 | UT | Monticello Rad Contaminated Props | Monticello | R | I |
| 503 | 02 | NJ | Woodland Route 532 Dump | Woodland Township | V R S | |
| 504 | 05 | IN | American Chemical Service, Inc. | Griffith | F | |
| 505 | 01 | MA | Salem Acres | Salem | | D |
| 506 | 01 | VT | Old Springfield Landfill | Springfield | V F | O |
| 507 | 02 | NY | Solvent Savers | Lincklaen | | D |
| 508 | 03 | VA | U.S. Titanium | Piney River | F S | O |
| 509 | 05 | IL | Galesburg/Koppers Co. | Galesburg | S | |
| 510 | 02 | NY | Hooker (Hyde Park) | Niagara Falls | V F S | |
| 511 | 05 | MI | SCA Independent Landfill | Muskegon Heights | S | |
| 512 | 09 | CA | MGM Brakes | Cloverdale | S | |
| 513 | 06 | LA | Bayou Sorrell | Bayou Sorrell | F | |
| 514 | 05 | MI | Duell & Gardner Landfill | Dalton Township | | D |
| 515 | 10 | WA | Mica Landfill | Mica | | D |
| 516 | 02 | NJ | Ellis Property | Evesham Township | R | O |
| 517 | 04 | KY | Distler Farm | Jefferson County | R F | O |
| 518 | 10 | WA | Harbor Island (Lead) | Seattle | | D |
| 519 | 05 | WI | Lemberger Transport & Recycling | Franklin Township | R | |
| 520 | 05 | OH | E.H. Schilling Landfill | Hamilton Township | R | I |
| 521 | 05 | MI | Cliff/Dow Dump | Marquette | F | |
| 522 | 02 | NY | Clothier Disposal | Town of Granby | R | |
| 523 | 03 | PA | Ambler Asbestos Piles | Ambler | V R F S | O |
| 524 | 10 | WA | Queen City Farms | Maple Valley | V | I |
| 525 | 03 | VA | L.A. Clarke & Son | Spotsylvania County | R | |

*: STATES' DESIGNATED TOP PRIORITY SITES

#: V = VOLUNTARY OR NEGOTIATED RESPONSE; R = FEDERAL AND STATE RESPONSE;
F = FEDERAL ENFORCEMENT; S = STATE ENFORCEMENT;
D = ACTIONS TO BE DETERMINED.@: I = IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITY UNDERWAY, ONE OR MORE OPERABLE UNITS;
O = ONE OR MORE OPERABLE UNITS COMPLETED, OTHERS MAY BE UNDERWAY;
C = IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITY COMPLETED FOR ALL OPERABLE UNITS.

NATIONAL PRIORITIES LIST (BY RANK)

| NPL RANK | EPA RG | ST | SITE NAME * | CITY/COUNTY | RESPONSE CATEGORY# | CLEANUP STATUS@ |
|-------------|-----------|----|-------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
|-------------|-----------|----|-------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------------------|

GROUP 11 (CON'T)

| | | | | | | |
|-----|----|----|-----------------------------------|--------------------|-----|---|
| 526 | 05 | WI | Scrap Processing Co., Inc. | Medford | | S |
| 527 | 03 | MD | Southern Maryland Wood Treating | Hollywood | R | 0 |
| 528 | 06 | NM | Homestake Mining Co. | Milan | V F | 0 |
| 529 | 09 | CA | Beckman Instruments (Porterville) | Porterville | | D |
| 530 | 04 | FL | Dubose Oil Products Co. | Cantonment | | S |
| 531 | 05 | MI | Mason County Landfill | Pere Marquette Twp | R F | 0 |
| 532 | 05 | MI | Cemetery Dump | Rose Center | R | |
| 533 | 02 | NJ | Hopkins Farm | Plumstead Township | | D |
| 534 | 01 | RI | Stamina Mills, Inc. | North Smithfield | | D |
| 535 | 05 | WI | Lemberger Landfill, Inc. | Whitelaw | | S |
| 536 | 05 | IN | Reilly Tar (Indianapolis Plant) | Indianapolis | F | |
| 537 | 01 | ME | Pinette's Salvage Yard | Washburn | R | 0 |
| 538 | 06 | TX | Harris (Farley Street) | Houston | V F | |
| 539 | 02 | NJ | Wilson Farm | Plumstead Township | | D |
| 540 | 03 | PA | Old City of York Landfill | Seven Valleys | V S | |
| 541 | 03 | PA | Modern Sanitation Landfill | Lower Windsor Twp | V S | |
| 542 | 05 | IL | Byron Salvage Yard | Byron | R | I |
| 543 | 05 | MI | North Bronson Industrial Area | Bronson | | D |
| 544 | 03 | PA | Stanley Kessler | King of Prussia | F | 0 |
| 545 | 02 | NJ | Imperial Oil/Champion Chemicals | Morganville | R | |
| 546 | 02 | NJ | Myers Property | Franklin Township | R | 0 |
| 547 | 02 | NJ | Pepe Field | Boonton | R | |
| 548 | 10 | WA | Northwest Transformer | Everson | R | 0 |
| 549 | 05 | WI | Sheboygan Harbor & River | Sheboygan | | D |
| 550 | 05 | MI | Ossineke Ground Water Contam | Ossineke | | D |

GROUP 12

| | | | | | | |
|-----|----|----|------------------------------------|---------------------|-----|---|
| 551 | 03 | WV | Follansbee Site | Follansbee | V F | I |
| 552 | 02 | NY | North Sea Municipal Landfill | North Sea | R | 0 |
| 553 | 09 | CA | Koppers Co., Inc. (Oroville Plant) | Oroville | | S |
| 554 | 09 | CA | Louisiana-Pacific Corp. | Oroville | | D |
| 555 | 05 | MI | South Macomb Disposal (Lf 9 & 9A) | Macomb Township | | D |
| 556 | 05 | MI | U.S. Aviax | Howard Township | V F | |
| 557 | 03 | PA | Walsh Landfill | Honeybrook Township | R F | I |
| 558 | 02 | NJ | Landfill & Development Co. | Mount Holly | | S |

*: STATES' DESIGNATED TOP PRIORITY SITES

#: V = VOLUNTARY OR NEGOTIATED RESPONSE; R = FEDERAL AND STATE RESPONSE;
 F = FEDERAL ENFORCEMENT; S = STATE ENFORCEMENT;
 D = ACTIONS TO BE DETERMINED.

@: I = IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITY UNDERWAY, ONE OR MORE OPERABLE UNITS;
 O = ONE OR MORE OPERABLE UNITS COMPLETED, OTHERS MAY BE UNDERWAY;
 C = IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITY COMPLETED FOR ALL OPERABLE UNITS.

NATIONAL PRIORITIES LIST (BY RANK)

| NPL RANK | EPA RC | ST | SITE NAME * | CITY/COUNTY | RESPONSE CATEGORY# | CLEANUP STATUS@ |
|------------------|-----------|----|------------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| GROUP 12 (CON'T) | | | | | | |
| 559 | 02 | NJ | Upper Deerfield Township Sif | Upper Deerfield Twp | | D |
| 560 | 02 | NY | Hertel Landfill | Plattekill | | D |
| 561 | 02 | NY | Haviland Complex | Town of Hyde Park | R | |
| 562 | 05 | MN | Adrian Municipal Well Field | Adrian | R | |
| 563 | 06 | NM | AT & SF (Clovis) | Clovis | V F | |
| 564 | 07 | KS | Strother Field Industrial Park | Cowley County | V S | 0 |
| 565 | 02 | NJ | Fried Industries | East Brunswick Twp | V R S | 0 |
| 566 | 02 | NY | American Thermostat Co. | South Cairo | V S | |
| 567 | 04 | TN | Lewisburg Dump | Lewisburg | | D |
| 568 | 05 | MI | McGraw Edison Corp. | Albion | V S | |
| 569 | 02 | NY | Goldisc Recordings, Inc. | Holbrook | V | |
| 570 | 04 | KY | Airco | Calvert City | V | |
| 571 | 03 | PA | Metal Banks | Philadelphia | V F | 0 |
| 572 | 02 | NY | Sarney Farm | Amenia | R | |
| 573 | 01 | MA | Rose Disposal Pit | Lanesboro | F S | |
| 574 | 05 | OH | Van Dale Junkyard | Marietta | | D |
| 575 | 04 | KY | B.F. Goodrich | Calvert City | V | |
| 576 | 05 | MI | Organic Chemicals, Inc. | Grandville | S | |
| 577 | 02 | NY | Volney Municipal Landfill | Town of Volney | V R S | 0 |
| 578 | 02 | NY | FMC Corp. (Dublin Road Landfill) | Town of Shelby | V S | |
| 579 | 01 | MA | Sullivan's Ledge | New Bedford | R F | |
| 580 | 04 | KY | Smith's Farm | Brooks | R | 0 |
| 581 | 02 | PR | Juncos Landfill | Juncos | V F | 0 |
| 582 | 07 | KS | Big River Sand Co. | Wichita | R | |
| 583 | 05 | IN | Bennett Stone Quarry | Bloomington | V F | 0 |
| 584 | 04 | FL | Munisport Landfill | North Miami | | D |
| 585 | 04 | AL | Stauffer Chem (LeMoyné Plant) | Axis | V | |
| 586 | 02 | NJ | M&T Delisa Landfill | Asbury Park | V F | |
| 587 | 06 | TX | Crystal City Airport | Crystal City | R | 0 |
| 588 | 04 | SC | Geiger (C & M Oil) | Rantoules | R | |
| 589 | 05 | WI | Moss-American (Kerr-McGee Oil Co.) | Milwaukee | R F | |
| 590 | 05 | WI | Waste Research & Reclamation Co. | Eau Claire | S | |
| 591 | 10 | OR | Gould, Inc. | Portland | V | I |
| 592 | 02 | NY | Cortese Landfill | Vil of Narrowsburg | V S | |
| 593 | 05 | MN | St. Louis River Site | St. Louis County | R | I |
| 594 | 05 | MI | Auto Ion Chemicals, Inc. | Kalamazoo | V F | 0 |
| 595 | 04 | SC | Carolawn, Inc. | Fort Lawn | V R F | 0 |
| 596 | 07 | IA | Midwest Manufacturing/North Farm | Kellogg | | D |

*: STATES' DESIGNATED TOP PRIORITY SITES

#: V = VOLUNTARY OR NEGOTIATED RESPONSE; R = FEDERAL AND STATE RESPONSE;
F = FEDERAL ENFORCEMENT; S = STATE ENFORCEMENT;
D = ACTIONS TO BE DETERMINED.@: I = IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITY UNDERWAY, ONE OR MORE OPERABLE UNITS;
O = ONE OR MORE OPERABLE UNITS COMPLETED, OTHERS MAY BE UNDERWAY;
C = IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITY COMPLETED FOR ALL OPERABLE UNITS.

NATIONAL PRIORITIES LIST (BY RANK)

| NPL RANK | EPA RG | ST | SITE NAME * | CITY/COUNTY | RESPONSE CATEGORY# | CLEANUP STATUS@ |
|-------------|-----------|----|-------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
|-------------|-----------|----|-------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------------------|

GROUP 12 (CON'T)

| | | | | | | |
|-----|----|----|---------------------------------|--------------------|-----|---|
| 597 | 03 | PA | Berks Sand Pit | Longswamp Township | R | 0 |
| 598 | 05 | MI | Sparta Landfill | Sparta Township | S | |
| 599 | 05 | IL | ACME Solvent (Morristown Plant) | Morristown | V R | I |
| 600 | 02 | NJ | Pomona Oaks Residential Wells | Galloway Township | R | 0 |

GROUP 13

| | | | | | | |
|-----|----|----|-----------------------------------|--------------------|-----|---|
| 601 | 04 | FL | Hipps Road Landfill | Duval County | R | 0 |
| 602 | 05 | MN | Long Prairie Ground Water Contam | Long Prairie | R | |
| 603 | 05 | MN | Waite Park Wells | Waite Park | R | |
| 604 | 09 | CA | Intel Magnetics | Santa Clara | | D |
| 605 | 09 | CA | Intel Corp. (Santa Clara III) | Santa Clara | | D |
| 606 | 04 | FL | Pepper Steel & Alloys, Inc. | Medley | R F | 0 |
| 607 | 01 | ME | O'Connor Co. | Augusta | V R | |
| 608 | 05 | WI | Oconomowoc Electroplating Co. Inc | Ashippin | R | |
| 609 | 05 | MI | Rasmussen's Dump | Green Oak Township | R | 0 |
| 610 | 02 | NY | Kenmark Textile Corp. | Farmingdale | | D |
| 611 | 03 | PA | Westline Site | Westline | R | 0 |
| 612 | 04 | KY | Marex Flats Nuclear Disposal | Hillsboro | R | |
| 613 | 08 | MT | Mouat Industries | Columbus | | D |
| 614 | 02 | NY | Claremont Polychemical | Old Bethpage | V S | |
| 615 | 05 | OH | Powell Road Landfill | Dayton | R | I |
| 616 | 03 | PA | Croydon TCE | Croydon | | D |
| 617 | 07 | IA | Vogel Paint & Wax Co. | Orange City | | S |
| 618 | 05 | MN | Kurt Manufacturing Co. | Fridley | | S |
| 619 | 05 | MI | Ionia City Landfill | Ionia | V F | I |
| 620 | 06 | TX | Koppers Co., Inc. (Texarkana Pit) | Texarkana | V F | |
| 621 | 08 | CO | Lincoln Park | Canon City | V F | |
| 622 | 08 | CO | Smuggler Mountain | Pitkin County | V F | |
| 623 | 05 | IN | Wedzeb Enterprises, Inc. | Lebanon | V F | I |
| 624 | 02 | PR | GE Wiring Devices | Juana Diaz | V F | |
| 625 | 05 | MI | Avenue "E" Ground Water Contamin | Traverse City | | S |
| 626 | 05 | OH | New Lyme Landfill | New Lyme | R | |
| 627 | 02 | NJ | Woodland Route 72 Dump | Woodland Township | V R | S |
| 628 | 02 | PR | RCA Del Caribe | Barceloneta | | D |
| 629 | 05 | MN | Koch Refining Co./N-Ren Corp. | Pine Bend | V S | |

*: STATES' DESIGNATED TOP PRIORITY SITES

#: V = VOLUNTARY OR NEGOTIATED RESPONSE; R = FEDERAL AND STATE RESPONSE;
F = FEDERAL ENFORCEMENT; S = STATE ENFORCEMENT;
D = ACTIONS TO BE DETERMINED.@: I = IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITY UNDERWAY, ONE OR MORE OPERABLE UNITS;
O = ONE OR MORE OPERABLE UNITS COMPLETED, OTHERS MAY BE UNDERWAY;
C = IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITY COMPLETED FOR ALL OPERABLE UNITS.

NATIONAL PRIORITIES LIST (BY RANK)

| NPL RANK | EPA RG | ST | SITE NAME * | CITY/COUNTY | RESPONSE CATEGORY# | CLEANUP STATUS@ |
|------------------|-----------|----|-----------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| GROUP 13 (CON'T) | | | | | | |
| 630 | 03 | PA | Brodhead Creek | Stroudsburg | R F | 0 |
| 631 | 05 | WI | Fadowski Drum Disposal | Franklin | | D |
| 632 | 10 | OR | United Chrome Products, Inc. | Corvallis | R | |
| 633 | 05 | MI | Anderson Development Co. | Adrian | R | |
| 634 | 05 | MI | Shiawassee River | Howell | | D |
| 635 | 03 | PA | Taylor Borough Dump | Taylor Borough | R | 0 |
| 636 | 03 | DE | Halby Chemical Co. | New Castle | | D |
| 637 | 03 | DE | Harvey & Knott Drum, Inc. | Kirkwood | R | 0 |
| 638 | 04 | TN | Callaway Pits | Gallaway | R F | 0 |
| 639 | 05 | OH | Big D Campground | Kingsville | F | |
| 640 | 06 | AR | Midland Products | Ola/Birta | R | |
| 641 | 02 | NY | Robintech, Inc./National Pipe Co. | Town of Vestal | R | |
| 642 | 02 | NY | BEC Trucking | Town of Vestal | | D |
| 643 | 03 | DE | Wildcat Landfill | Dover | R | |
| 644 | 05 | MI | Burrows Sanitation | Hartford | V R | 0 |
| 645 | 03 | PA | Biosenski Landfill | West Cain Township | F | |
| 646 | 03 | VA | Rhinehart Tire Fire Dump | Frederick County | V R F | 0 |
| 647 | 03 | DE | Delaware City PVC Plant | Delaware City | V F | |
| 648 | 03 | MD | Limestone Road | Cumberland | R | 0 |
| 649 | 02 | NY | Hooker (102nd Street) | Niagara Falls | V F S | |
| 650 | 03 | DE | New Castle Steel | New Castle County | | D |

GROUP 14

| | | | | | | |
|-----|----|----|-------------------------------|--------------------|-----|---|
| 651 | 06 | NM | United Nuclear Corp. | Church Rock | F | |
| 652 | 06 | AR | Industrial Waste Control | Fort Smith | F | |
| 653 | 09 | CA | Celtor Chemical Works | Hoopa | R | 0 |
| 654 | 01 | MA | Haverhill Municipal Landfill | Haverhill | | D |
| 655 | 04 | AL | Perdido Ground Water Contam | Perdido | V | 0 |
| 656 | 02 | NY | Marathon Battery Corp. | Cold Springs | R | |
| 657 | 02 | NY | Colesville Municipal Landfill | Town of Colesville | | D |
| 658 | 04 | FL | Yellow Water Road Dump | Baldwin | R F | 0 |
| 659 | 05 | OH | Skinner Landfill | West Chester | R | 1 |
| 660 | 04 | NC | Chemtronics, Inc. | Swannanoa | V R | 0 |
| 661 | 05 | IN | MIDCO II | Gary | R F | 0 |
| 662 | 03 | MD | Kane & Lombard Street Drums | Baltimore | R | 0 |

*: STATES' DESIGNATED TOP PRIORITY SITES

#: V = VOLUNTARY OR NEGOTIATED RESPONSE; R = FEDERAL AND STATE RESPONSE;
F = FEDERAL ENFORCEMENT; S = STATE ENFORCEMENT;
D = ACTIONS TO BE DETERMINED.@: I = IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITY UNDERWAY, ONE OR MORE OPERABLE UNITS;
O = ONE OR MORE OPERABLE UNITS COMPLETED, OTHERS MAY BE UNDERWAY;
C = IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITY COMPLETED FOR ALL OPERABLE UNITS.

NATIONAL PRIORITIES LIST (BY RANK)

| NPL RANK | EPA RC | ST | SITE NAME * | CITY/COUNTY | RESPONSE CATEGORY# | CLEANUP STATUS@ |
|------------------|-----------|----|-----------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| GROUP 14 (CON'T) | | | | | | |
| 663 | 07 | MO | Shenandoah Stables | Moscow Mills | F | |
| 664 | 10 | WA | Silver Mountain Mine | Loomis | R | 0 |
| 665 | 06 | TX | Petro-Chemical (Turtle Bayou) | Liberty County | R | |
| 666 | 05 | OH | Republic Steel Corp. Quarry | Elyria | | D |
| 667 | 06 | LA | Bayou Bonfouca | Slidell | R F | I |
| 668 | 09 | CA | Intel Corp. (Mountain View Plant) | Mountain View | F | |
| 669 | 09 | CA | Raytheon Corp. | Mountain View | F | I |
| 670 | 05 | MN | Agate Lake Scrapyard | Fairview Township | R | 0 |
| 671 | 03 | VA | Saltville Waste Disposal Ponds | Saltville | R | 0 |
| 672 | 01 | MA | Shpack Landfill | Norton/Attleboro | | D |
| 673 | 03 | PA | Kimberton Site | Kimberton Borough | | D |
| 674 | 01 | MA | Norwood PCBs | Norwood | R | 0 |
| 675 | 03 | MD | Middletown Road Dump | Annapolis | R F | 0 |
| 676 | 10 | WA | Pesticide Lab (Yakima) | Yakima | | D |
| 677 | 05 | IN | Lemon Lane Landfill | Bloomington | V F | I |
| 678 | 05 | IN | Tri-State Plating | Columbus | | D |
| 679 | 10 | ID | Arrcom (Drexler Enterprises) | Rathdrum | R | |
| 680 | 01 | NH | Coakley Landfill | North Hampton | V R | S |
| 681 | 03 | PA | Fischer & Porter Co. | Warminster | V F | 0 |
| 682 | 09 | CA | Jibboom Junkyard | Sacramento | R | |
| 683 | 02 | NJ | A. O. Polymer | Sparta Township | R | |
| 684 | 05 | WI | Wausau Ground Water Contamination | Wausau | R | 0 |
| 685 | 02 | NJ | Dover Municipal Well 4 | Dover Township | R | |
| 686 | 02 | NJ | Rockaway Township Wells | Rockaway | | D |
| 687 | 05 | WI | Delavan Municipal Well #4 | Delavan | | S |
| 688 | 07 | MO | North-U Drive Well Contamination | Springfield | R | 0 |
| 689 | 09 | CA | San Gabriel Valley (Area 3) | Alhambra | R | |
| 690 | 09 | CA | San Gabriel Valley (Area 4) | La Puente | R | |
| 691 | 10 | WA | American Lake Gardens | Tacoma | V R F | I |
| 692 | 10 | WA | Greenacres Landfill | Spokane County | R | |
| 693 | 10 | WA | Northside Landfill | Spokane | R | 0 |
| 694 | 06 | OK | Sand Springs Petrochemical Cmplx | Sand Springs | R F | 0 |
| 695 | 06 | TX | Pesses Chemical Co. | Fort Worth | R | 0 |
| 696 | 05 | MN | East Bethel Demolition Landfill | East Bethel Township | | D |
| 697 | 06 | TX | Triangle Chemical Co. | Bridge City | R | 0 |
| 698 | 02 | NJ | PJP Landfill | Jersey City | R | S |
| 699 | 03 | PA | Craig Farm Drum | Parker | | D |
| 700 | 03 | PA | Voortman Farm | Upper Saucon Twp | R | 0 |

*: STATES' DESIGNATED TOP PRIORITY SITES

#: V = VOLUNTARY OR NEGOTIATED RESPONSE; R = FEDERAL AND STATE RESPONSE;
F = FEDERAL ENFORCEMENT; S = STATE ENFORCEMENT;
D = ACTIONS TO BE DETERMINED.@: I = IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITY UNDERWAY, ONE OR MORE OPERABLE UNITS;
O = ONE OR MORE OPERABLE UNITS COMPLETED, OTHERS MAY BE UNDERWAY;
C = IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITY COMPLETED FOR ALL OPERABLE UNITS.

NATIONAL PRIORITIES LIST (BY RANK)

| NPL RANK | EPA RG | ST | SITE NAME * | CITY/COUNTY | RESPONSE CATEGORY# | CLEANUP STATUS@ |
|-------------|-----------|----|-------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
|-------------|-----------|----|-------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------------------|

GROUP 15

| | | | | | | |
|-----|----|----|------------------------------|-----------|---|---|
| 701 | 05 | IL | Belvidere Municipal Landfill | Belvidere | R | I |
| 702 | 07 | MO | Bee Cee Manufacturing Co. | Malden | | D |
| 703 | 03 | PA | Lansdowne Radiation Site | Lansdowne | R | I |

*: STATES' DESIGNATED TOP PRIORITY SITES

#: V = VOLUNTARY OR NEGOTIATED RESPONSE; R = FEDERAL AND STATE RESPONSE;
F = FEDERAL ENFORCEMENT; S = STATE ENFORCEMENT;
D = ACTIONS TO BE DETERMINED.@: I = IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITY UNDERWAY, ONE OR MORE OPERABLE UNITS;
O = ONE OR MORE OPERABLE UNITS COMPLETED, OTHERS MAY BE UNDERWAY;
C = IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITY COMPLETED FOR ALL OPERABLE UNITS.

NUMBER OF NPL SITES: 703

[FR Doc. 86-12003 Filed 6-9-86; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5560-50-C

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 300

[SW-FRL-2969-5]

Amendment to National Oil and Hazardous Substances Contingency Plan; National Priorities List

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Proposed Rules.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA") is proposing the fifth update to the National Priorities List ("NPL"). This update contains 45 sites. The NPL is Appendix B to the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Contingency Plan ("NCP"), which EPA promulgated pursuant to section 105 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 ("CERCLA") and Executive Order 12316. CERCLA requires that the NPL be revised at least annually. Today's notice proposes the fifth major revision to the NPL.

These sites are being proposed because they meet the eligibility requirements of the NPL. EPA has included on the NPL releases and threatened releases of designated hazardous substances, as well as "pollutants or contaminants" which may present an imminent and substantial danger to the public health or welfare. This notice provides the public with an opportunity to comment on placing these 45 sites on the NPL.

DATE: Comments may be submitted on or before August 11, 1986.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be mailed to Russel H. Wyer, Director, Hazardous Site Control Division (Attn: NPL Staff), Office of Emergency and Remedial Response (WH-548E), Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street, SW., Washington, DC 20460.

Addresses for the Headquarters and Regional dockets are provided below. The contents of these dockets are described in Section I of the Supplementary information.

Denise Sines, Headquarters, U.S. EPA CERCLA Docket Office, Waterside Mall, Subbasement, 401 M Street, S.W., Washington DC 20460, 202/382-3046

Peg Nelson, Region 1, U.S. EPA Library, Room E121, John F. Kennedy Federal Bldg., Boston, MA 02203, 617/223-5791

Carole Petersen, Region 2, Site Investigation & Compliance Branch, 26 Federal Plaza, 7th Floor, Room 737, New York, NY 10278, 212/264-8677

Diane McCreary, Region 3, U.S. EPA Library, 5th Floor, 841 Chestnut Bldg., 9th & Chestnut Streets, Philadelphia, PA 19107, 215/597-0580

Gayle Alston, Region 4, U.S. EPA Library, Room G-6, 345 Courtland Street, N.E., Atlanta, GA 30365, 404/347-4216

Lou Tilley, Region 5, U.S. EPA Library, 16th Floor, 230 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, IL 60604, 312/353-2022

Barry Nash, Region 6, InterFirst II Bldg., 1201 Elm Street, Dallas, TX 75270, 214/767-4075

Connie McKenzie, Region 7, U.S. EPA Library, 726 Minnesota Avenue, Kansas City, KS 66101, 913/236-2828

Dolores Eddy, Region 8, U.S. EPA Library, 999 18th Street, Suite 1300, Denver, CO 80202-2413, 303/293-1444

Jean Cinciello, Region 9, U.S. EPA Library, 6th Floor, 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, CA 94105, 415/974-8076

Joan Shafer, Region 10, U.S. EPA, 11th Floor, 1200 6th Avenue, Mail Stop 525, Seattle, WA 98101, 206/442-4903

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Trudi J. Fancher, Hazardous Site Control Division, Office of Emergency and Remedial Response (WH-548E), Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20460, Phone (800) 424-9346 (or 382-3000 in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Table of Contents

- I. Introduction.
- II. Purpose of the NPL.
- III. NPL Update Process and Schedule.
- IV. Eligibility.
- V. Contents of the Proposed Fifth NPL Update.
- VI. Regulatory Impact Analysis.
- VII. Regulatory Flexibility Act Analysis.

I. Introduction

Pursuant to section 105 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, 42 U.S.C. 9601-9657 ("CERCLA" or "the Act") and Executive Order 12316 (46 FR 42237, August 20, 1981), the Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA" or "the Agency") promulgated the revised National Contingency Plan ("NCP"), 40 CFR Part 300, on July 16, 1982 (47 FR 31180). EPA promulgated further revisions to the NCP on September 16, 1985 (50 FR 37624) and November 20, 1985 (50 FR 47912). These amendments to the NCP implement the responsibilities and authorities created by CERCLA to respond to releases and threatened releases of hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants.

Section 105(8)(A) of CERCLA requires that the NCP include criteria for

determining priorities among releases or threatened releases throughout the United States for the purpose of taking remedial action and, to the extent practicable, taking into account the potential urgency of such action, for the purpose of taking removal action. Removal action involves cleanup or other actions that are taken in response to emergency conditions or on a short-term or temporary basis (CERCLA section 101(23)). Remedial action tends to be long term in nature and involves response actions which are consistent with a permanent remedy for a release (CERCLA section 101(24)). Criteria for determining priorities are included in the Hazard Ranking System ("HRS"), which EPA promulgated as Appendix A of the NCP (47 FR 31219, July 16, 1982).

Section 105(8)(B) of CERCLA requires that the statutory criteria be used to prepare a list of national priorities among the known releases or threatened releases throughout the United States, and that to the extent practicable, at least 400 sites be designated individually. CERCLA requires that this National Priorities List ("NPL") be included as part of the NCP. Today, in this notice, EPA is proposing to add 45 sites to the NPL, bringing the total number of proposed sites to 185. On March 7, 1986 (51 FR 7935), EPA published a notice to delete 8 sites from the NPL, resulting in a final NPL of 533 sites. In a separate notice today, EPA is promulgating 170 sites, resulting in a final NPL of 703 sites. The total number of final and proposed NPL sites is now 888. EPA is proposing to include on the NPL sites at which there are or have been releases or threatened releases of hazardous substances, or of "pollutants or contaminants." The discussion below may refer to "releases or threatened releases" simply as "releases," "facilities," or "sites."

This Federal Register notice proposing 45 sites to the NPL opens the formal 60-day public comment period. Comments may be mailed to Russel H. Wyer, Director, Hazardous Site Control Division (Attn: NPL Staff), Office of Emergency and Remedial Response (WH-548E), Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street, SW., Washington, D.C. 20460. The Headquarters public docket for the fifth update to the NPL will contain: Hazard Ranking System (HRS) score sheets for each proposed site; a Documentation Record for each site describing the information used to compute the scores; and a list of document references. The Headquarters public docket is located in EPA Headquarters, Waterside Mall subbasement, 401 M Street, SW.,

Washington, D.C. 20460, and is available for viewing by appointment only from 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m., Monday through Friday excluding holidays. Requests for copies of the documents from the Headquarters public docket should be directed to the EPA Headquarters docket office. The HRS score sheets and the Documentation Record for each site in a particular EPA Region will be available for viewing in that Regional Office when this notice is published. These Regional dockets will also contain documents referenced in the Documentation Record which contain the background data EPA relied upon in calculating or evaluating the HRS scores. Copies of these background documents may be viewed in the appropriate Regional Office, and copies may be obtained from the Region. Documents with some relevance to the scoring of each site, but which were not used as references, may also be viewed and copied by arrangement with the appropriate EPA Regional Office. An informal written request, rather than a formal request, should be the ordinary procedure for obtaining copies of any of these documents. Requests for HRS score sheets and Documentation Records should be directed to either Headquarters or the appropriate Regional Office docket. Requests for background documents should be directed to the appropriate Regional Superfund Branch Office.

Comments submitted to Headquarters during the 60-day public comment period may be viewed only in the Headquarters docket during the comment period. A complete set of comments pertaining to sites in a particular EPA Region will be available for viewing in the Regional Office docket approximately one week following the close of the formal comment period. Comments received after the close of the comment period will be available at Headquarters and in the appropriate Regional Office docket on an "as received" basis. An informal written request, rather than a formal request, should be the ordinary procedure for obtaining copies of these comments. Addresses for the Headquarters and Regional Office dockets are provided in the summary.

II. Purpose of the NPL

The primary purpose of the NPL is stated in the legislative history of CERCLA (Report of the Committee on Environment and Public Works, Senate Report No. 96-848, 96th Cong., 2d Sess. 60 (1980)):

The priority lists serve primarily informational purposes, identifying for the

States and the public those facilities and sites or other releases which appear to warrant remedial actions. Inclusion of a facility or site on the list does not in itself reflect a judgment of the activities of its owner or operator, it does not require those persons to undertake any action, nor does it assign liability to any person. Subsequent government action in the form of remedial actions or enforcement actions will be necessary in order to do so, and these actions will be attended by all appropriate procedural safeguards.

The purpose of the NPL, therefore, is primarily to serve as an informational tool for use by EPA in identifying sites that appear to present a significant risk to public health or the environment. The initial identification of a site for the NPL is intended primarily to guide EPA in determining which sites warrant further investigation, to assess the nature and extent of the public health and environmental risks associated with the site, and to determine what CERCLA-financed remedial action(s), if any, may be appropriate. Inclusion of a site on the NPL does not establish that EPA necessarily will undertake remedial actions. Moreover, listing does not require any action of any private party, nor does it determine the liability of any party for the cost of cleanup at the site. In addition, a site need not be on the NPL to be the subject of CERCLA-financed removal actions, remedial investigations/feasibility studies, or actions brought pursuant to sections 106 or 107(a)(4)(B) of CERCLA.

In addition, although the HRS scores used to place sites on the NPL may be helpful to the Agency in determining priorities for cleanup and other response activities among sites on the NPL, EPA does not rely on the scores as the sole means of determining such priorities, as discussed below. The information collected to develop HRS scores is not sufficient in itself to determine the appropriate remedy for a particular site. EPA relies on further, more detailed studies to determine what response, if any, is appropriate. These studies evaluate more fully the extent of the contamination in terms of area and severity, and the risk to affected populations and the environment. These studies also consider the cost to correct problems at the site and the response actions that have been taken by potential responsible parties or others. Decisions on the type and extent of action to be taken at these sites are made in accordance with the criteria contained in Subpart F of the NCP. After conducting these additional studies, EPA may conclude that it is not desirable to conduct response action at some sites on the NPL because of more pressing needs at other sites. Given the

limited resources available in the Hazardous Substance Response Trust Fund established under CERCLA, the Agency must carefully balance the relative needs for response at the numerous sites it has studied. Also, it is possible that EPA will conclude after further analysis that the site does not warrant response action.

III. NPL Update Process and Schedule

Pursuant to section 105(8)(B) of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. 9605(8)(B), EPA is required to establish, as part of the NCP, a priority list of sites. The NPL fulfills that obligation. The purpose of this notice is to propose the addition of 45 new sites to the NPL.

CERCLA requires that the NPL be revised at least once per year. Accordingly, EPA published the first NPL on September 8, 1983 (48 FR 40658), containing 406 sites. The NPL has been amended several times since then, including the addition of 170 sites which are promulgated elsewhere in today's *Federal Register* (see 49 FR 19480, May 8, 1984; 49 FR 37070, September 21, 1984; 50 FR 6320, February 14, 1985; and 50 FR 37630, September 16, 1985) (51 FR 7935). The NPL now includes 703 final sites. The Agency has periodically proposed major additions to the NPL (see 49 FR 40320, October 15, 1984; 50 FR 14115, April 10, 1985; 50 FR 37950, September 16, 1985).

In addition to these periodic updates, it is sometimes desirable in rare instances to propose or promulgate separately individual sites on the NPL because of the apparent need for expedited remedial activities. This occurred in the case of the proposal of Times Beach, Missouri (48 FR 9311, March 4, 1983), the promulgation of four San Gabriel Valley, California, sites (49 FR 19480, May 8, 1984), the promulgation of two New Jersey radium sites in Glen Ridge and Montclair/West Orange (50 FR 6320, February 14, 1985), and the promulgation of the Lansdowne Radiation site, Lansdowne, Pennsylvania (50 FR 37630, September 16, 1985).

There are three mechanisms for placing sites on the NPL. The principal mechanism is the application of the HRS. Those sites that score 28.50 or greater on the HRS, and which are otherwise eligible, are proposed for listing. In addition, States may designate a single site as the State top priority. In rare instances, EPA may utilize the listing provision promulgated as § 300.66(b)(4) of the NCP (50 FR 37624, September 16, 1985).

Section 300.66(b)(4) of the NCP allows certain sites with HRS scores below

28.50 to be eligible for the NPL. These sites may qualify for the NPL if all of the following occur:

- The Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services has issued a health advisory which recommends dissociation of individuals from the release.
- EPA determines that the release poses a significant threat to public health.
- EPA anticipates that it will be more cost-effective to use its remedial authority than to use its removal authority to respond to the release.

The Lansdowne Radiation site was added to the NPL (50 FR 37630, September 16, 1985) pursuant to this section of the NCP.

As with the establishment of the initial NPL and subsequent revisions, States have the primary responsibility for selecting and scoring sites that are candidates and submitting the candidate sites to the EPA Regional Offices. For each proposed NPL update, EPA informs the States of the closing dates for submission of candidate sites to EPA. The EPA Regional Offices then conduct a quality control review of the States' candidate sites. After conducting this review, the EPA Regional Offices submit candidate sites to EPA Headquarters. The Regions may include candidate sites in addition to those submitted by States. In reviewing these submissions, EPA Headquarters conducts further quality assurance audits to ensure accuracy and consistency among the various EPA and State offices participating in the scoring.

This **Federal Register** notice lists sites that EPA is proposing to add to the NPL. These proposed additions of 43 non-Federal sites and 2 Federal sites, are listed in Tables 1 and 2 immediately following this Preamble.

Public Comment Period

EPA requests public comment on these proposed additions. Comments will be accepted for 60 days following publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. EPA is also soliciting comments on two Federal facilities that have HRS scores 28.50 or higher, and which are now eligible for the NPL pursuant to the NCP amendments of November 20, 1985 (50 FR 47912). Section IV of this Preamble includes a discussion of EPA's Federal facilities policy.

The "ADDRESSES" portion of this notice contains information on where to obtain documents relating to the scoring of the 45 proposed sites. After considering the relevant comments received during the comment period,

EPA will add to the NPL all proposed sites that meet EPA's criteria for listing. In past NPL rulemakings, EPA has considered comments received after the close of the comment period. Because the Agency has now increased the frequency of NPL rulemakings, EPA may no longer have the opportunity to consider late comments.

IV. Eligibility

CERCLA restricts EPA's authority to respond to certain categories of releases and expressly excludes some substances from the definition of release. In addition, as a matter of policy, EPA may choose not to use CERCLA to respond to certain types of releases because other authorities can be used to achieve cleanup of these releases. Preambles to previous NPL rulemakings have discussed examples of these policies. See, e.g., 48 FR 40658 (September 8, 1983); 49 FR 37070 (September 21, 1984); and 49 FR 40320 (October 15, 1984). Generally, this proposed update continues these past eligibility policies. The policy regarding Federal facilities is relevant to this update, and is discussed below.

Federal Facility Releases

CERCLA section 111(e)(3) prohibits use of the Trust Fund for remedial actions at Federally-owned facilities, and until the November 20, 1985, amendments to the NCP (50 FR 47912), § 300.66(e)(2) of the NCP prevented the placing of Federal facilities on the NPL. Section 300.66(e)(2) of the NCP has now been deleted, removing the prohibition of listing Federal facilities on the NPL.

Prior to proposal of NPL Update #2 (49 FR 40320, October 15, 1984), EPA did not propose for listing any site on the NPL where the release resulted solely from a Federal facility regardless of whether contamination remained on-site or migrated off-site. However, based on public comments received from previous NPL announcements, EPA proposed 36 Federal facilities for NPL Update #2. EPA did not plan to promulgate the 36 Federal facilities unless the NCP was revised to permit the placing of Federal facilities on the NPL.

In Updates #3 (50 FR 14115, April 10, 1985), and #4 (50 FR 37950, September 18, 1985), the Agency did not include any additional Federal facilities in the proposed rule because the NCP amendments had not been promulgated. However, six Update #3 Federal facilities and three Update #4 Federal facilities which met the criteria for proposal were named in the preambles of those updates. For #5, the Agency is proposing two Federal facilities listed in Table 2 and requests comments on the

scoring of these sites. The Agency intends to promulgate Federal facilities which have been proposed or identified in the preambles of previous updates in future NPL rulemakings.

Individual Site Issues

Silver Bow Creek/Butte Area Site—Butte, Montana. The Agency believes that the existing Silver Bow Creek NPL site in Butte, Montana, and the Butte Area should be considered as one site. In order to assess the appropriateness of this decision, the Agency solicits comments on the expansion of the Silver Bow Creek site, and will evaluate comments received before proceeding with any Fund-financed remedial actions in the Butte Area.

At the time of listing on the NPL (48 FR 40658, September 8, 1983), the Silver Bow Creek site was characterized as approximately 28 stream miles. Preliminary evaluation of data from the remedial investigation/feasibility study (RI/FS) indicates that sources upstream of the existing Silver Bow Creek site are contributing to contamination in the creek. EPA considered two options for dealing with the upstream problems—proposing a separate Butte Area Site or expanding the existing Silver Bow Creek site. The Butte Area was scored separately; however, the Agency believes it is more appropriate to expand the Silver Bow Creek site to include the Butte Area.

A thorough analysis of the relationship between the Silver Bow Creek site and the Butte Area led EPA to conclude that the geographical relationship of the headwaters of Silver Bow Creek (which originate a short distance upstream of the Silver Bow Creek drainage area) and the portion of the Silver Bow Creek downstream of the City of Butte favors treating these areas as one site under CERCLA. In addition, EPA decided to analyze the nature and extent of contamination under one comprehensive RI/FS because it appears that contamination from both areas threatens the same surface water body and the same target population. The geographic relationship of the two areas suggests that the Butte Area is a major source of contamination to the Silver Bow Creek, which is the major receiving water body for mining discharges and drainage from the Butte Area. EPA treats sources of and extent of contamination at other sites in this way and concluded that it was logical to evaluate the Butte Area and the Silver Bow Creek site together. Adding the Butte Area does not greatly expand the site geographically. Documents supporting the technical justification for

expanding the Silver Bow Creek NPL site to include the Butte Area are available in the public docket.

Butler Mine Tunnel—Pittston, Pennsylvania. The Butler Mine Tunnel, situated in a populated area of Pittston, Pennsylvania, is a mine discharge tunnel designed to drain acid mine waste into the Susquehanna River. The tunnel is honeycombed with boreholes and shafts. In addition to mine drainage, the disposal of hazardous materials into the tunnel is also suspected.

In July 1979, EPA initiated an emergency response action at the site under section 311 of the Clean Water Act because of a release of oily material from the tunnel into the river. Response actions ended in January 1981. In 1980, the State began monitoring the outfall of the tunnel via an automated detection system. The State continued to monitor the outfall until 1984, during which time there was no evidence of any discharge from the tunnel.

On October 23, 1981, the Agency announced the Interim Priorities List (IPL), which included the Butler Mine Tunnel site. The IPL was a preliminary list of 115 sites developed by the Agency prior to the proposal of the first NPL. In February 1982, the State of Pennsylvania indicated that no further response actions were warranted at the Butler Mine Tunnel site based on monitoring results of existing conditions. On December 30, 1982, the first NPL was proposed in the *Federal Register* (47 FR 58476). Butler Mine Tunnel was not included on the list, but the preamble stated that all appropriate Fund-financed cleanup had been completed.

Following heavy rains associated with Hurricane Gloria, oily material was observed discharging from the Butler Mine Tunnel outfall into the Susquehanna River on September 27, 1985. On September 28, 1985, EPA again initiated an emergency response action, including measures to sample and contain the oily material. However, remedial actions may be needed in the future to provide a long-term resolution of problems at Butler Mine Tunnel.

Consequently, EPA believes that it would be appropriate to propose the Butler Mine Tunnel for the NPL at this time in order to provide the Agency with the response capabilities provided under the remedial action authorities of CERCLA.

V. Contents of the Proposed Fifth NPL Update

All sites in today's proposed addition to the NPL received HRS scores of 28.50 or above.

Following this preamble is a list of the 45 sites proposed for addition to the NPL (Tables 1 and 2). Each entry on the list contains the name of the facility, the State and city or county in which it is located, and the corresponding EPA Region. Each proposed site is placed by score in a group corresponding to the groups of 50 sites presented within the final NPL. For example, sites in group 5 of the proposed update have scores that fall within the range of scores covered by the fifth group of 50 sites on the final NPL. Each entry is accompanied by one or more notations referencing the status of response and cleanup activities at the site at the time this list was prepared.

EPA categorizes NPL sites based on the type of response at each site (Fund-financed, Federal enforcement, State enforcement, and/or voluntary action). In addition, EPA is including the cleanup status codes to identify sites where significant response activities are underway or completed. The codes are included in response to public requests for information regarding actual site cleanup activities, and to acknowledge situations where EPA, States, or responsible parties have undertaken response actions. The response categories/status codes for these proposed sites and all final NPL sites will be updated each time EPA promulgates additional sites on the NPL.

Response Categories

The following response categories are used to designate the type of response underway. One or more categories may apply to each site.

Federal and/or State Response (R). This category includes sites at which EPA or State agencies have started or completed response actions. These include removal actions, nonenforcement remedial planning, and/or remedial actions under CERCLA (NCP, § 300.66(f)-(i) 47 FR 31217, July 16, 1982). For purposes of assigning a category, the response action commences when EPA obligates funds.

Federal Enforcement (F). This category includes sites where the United States has filed a civil complaint (including cost recovery actions) or issued an administrative order under CERCLA or RCRA. It also includes sites where a Federal court has mandated some form of response action following a judicial proceeding. All sites at which EPA has obligated funds for enforcement-lead remedial investigations and feasibility studies are also included in this category.

A number of sites on the NPL are the subject of legal investigations or have been formally referred to the Department of Justice for possible

enforcement action. EPA's policy is not to release information concerning a possible enforcement action until a lawsuit has been filed. Accordingly, sites subject to pending Federal action are not included in this category, but are included under "Category To Be Determined."

State Enforcement (S). This category includes sites where a State has filed a civil complaint or issued an administrative order. It also includes sites at which a State court has mandated some form of response action following a judicial proceeding. Sites where a State has obligated funds for enforcement-lead remedial investigations and feasibility studies are also included in this category.

It is assumed that State policy precludes the release of information concerning possible enforcement actions until such action has been formally taken. Accordingly, sites subject to possible State legal action are not included in this category, but are included under "Category To Be Determined."

Voluntary or Negotiated Response (V). This category includes sites where private parties are conducting response actions pursuant to settlement agreements, consent decrees, or consent orders to which EPA or the State is a party. Usually, the response actions result from a Federal or State enforcement action. This category includes privately-financed remedial planning, removal actions, and/or remedial actions.

Category To Be Determined (D). This category includes all sites not listed in any other category. A wide range of activities may be in progress at sites in this category. EPA or a State may be evaluating the type of response action to undertake, or a response action may be determined but funds not yet obligated. Sites where a Federal or State enforcement case may be under authorities other than CERCLA or RCRA are also included in this category. Additionally included in this category are sites where responsible parties may be undertaking cleanup actions that are not covered by a consent decree, consent order, or administrative order.

Cleanup Status Codes

EPA assigns codes to indicate the status of Fund-financed or private party cleanup activities underway or completed at proposed and final NPL sites. Fund-financed response activities which are coded include: significant removal actions, source control remedial actions, and off-site remedial actions. The status of cleanup activities

conducted by responsible parties under a consent decree, court order, or an administrative order also is coded, as are similar cleanup activities taken independently of EPA and/or the State. Remedial planning activities or engineering studies do not receive a cleanup status code.

Many sites on the NPL are cleaned up in stages or "operable units." For purposes of cleanup status coding, an operable unit is a discrete action taken as part of the entire site cleanup that significantly decreases or eliminates a release, threat of release, or pathway of exposure. One or more operable units may be necessary to complete the cleanup of a hazardous waste site. Operable units may include significant removal actions taken to stabilize deteriorating site conditions or provide alternative water supplies, and remedial actions. A simple removal action (constructing fences or berms or lowering free-board) that does not eliminate a significant release, threat of release, or pathway of exposure is not considered an operable unit for purposes of cleanup status coding.

The following cleanup status codes (and definitions) are used to designate the status of cleanup activities at proposed and final sites on the NPL. Only one code is used to denote the status of actual cleanup activity at each site since the codes are mutually exclusive.

Implementation activities are underway for one or more operable units (I). Field work is in progress at the site for implementation of one or more removal or remedial operable units, but no operable units are completed.

Implementation activities are completed for one or more (but not all) operable units. Implementation activities may be underway for additional operable units (O). Field work has been completed for one or more operative units, but additional site cleanup actions are necessary.

Implementation activities are completed for all operable units (C). All actions agreed upon for remedial action at the site have been completed, and performance monitoring has commenced. Further site activities could occur if EPA considers such activities necessary.

VI. Regulatory Impact Analysis

The costs of cleanup actions that may be taken at sites are not directly attributable to listing on the NPL, as explained below.

Therefore, the Agency has determined that this rulemaking is not a "major" regulation under Executive Order 12291. EPA has conducted a preliminary

analysis of the economic implications of today's proposal to add new sites. EPA believes that the kinds of economic effects associated with this revision are generally similar to those identified in the regulatory impact analysis (RIA) prepared in 1982 for the revisions to the NCP pursuant to section 105 of CERCLA (47 FR 31180, July 16, 1982) and the economic analysis prepared when the amendments to the NCP were proposed (50 FR 5882, February 12, 1985). The Agency believes the anticipated economic effects related to proposing the addition of 45 sites to the NPL can be characterized in terms of the conclusions of the earlier RIA and the most recent economic analysis.

Costs

EPA has determined that this proposed rulemaking is not a "major" regulation under Executive Order 12291 because inclusion of a site on the NPL does not itself impose any costs. It does not establish the EPA will necessarily undertake remedial action, nor does it require any action by a private party or determine its liability for site response costs. Costs that arise out of site responses result from site-by-site decisions about what actions to take, not directly from the act of listing itself. Nonetheless, it is useful to consider the costs associated with responding to all sites included in a proposed rulemaking. This action was submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review.

The major events that follow the proposed listing of a site on the NPL are a responsible party search and a remedial investigation/feasibility study (RI/FS) which determines whether remedial actions will be undertaken at a site. Design and construction of the selected remedial alternative follow completion of the RI/FS, and operation and maintenance (O&M) activities may continue after construction has been completed.

Costs associated with responsible party searches are initially borne by EPA. Responsible parties may bear some or all the costs of the RI/FS, design and construction, and O&M, or the costs may be shared by EPA and the States on a 90:10% basis (50:50% in the case of State or locally owned sites). Additionally, States assume all costs for O&M activities after the first year at sites involving Fund-financed remedial actions.

Rough estimates of the average per-site and total costs associated with each of the above activities are presented below. At this time, EPA is unable to predict what portions of the total costs will be borne by responsible parties,

since the distribution of costs depends on the extent of voluntary and negotiated response and the success of any cost recovery actions.

| | | Average total cost per site ¹ |
|---|--|--|
| Cost category: | | |
| RI/FS..... | | \$800,000 |
| Remedial design..... | | 440,000 |
| Remedial action..... | | ² 7,200,000 |
| Net present value of O&M ³ | | ² 3,770,000 |

¹ 1985 U.S. dollars.

² Includes State cost share.

³ Assumes cost of O&M over 30 years, \$400,000 for the first year and 10% discount rate.

Source: "Extent of the Hazardous Release Problem and Future Funding Needs-CERCLA Section 301(a)(1)(c) Study", December 1984, Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response, U.S. EPA.

Costs to States associated with today's proposed amendment arise from the required State cost-share of: (1) 10 percent of remedial action and 10 percent of first year O&M costs at privately-owned sites; and (2) at least 50 percent of the remedial planning (RI/FS and remedial design), remedial action and first year O&M costs at State or locally owned sites. States will assume all the cost for O&M after the first year. Using the assumptions developed in the 1982 RIA for the NCP, EPA has assumed that 90 percent of the 43 non-Federal sites proposed to be added to the NPL in this amendment will be privately-owned and 10 percent will be State- or locally-owned. Therefore, using the budget projections presented above, the cost to States of undertaking Federal remedial actions at all 43 non-Federal sites would be \$194 million, of which \$147 million is attributable to the State O&M cost.

Listing a hazardous waste site on the final NPL does not itself cause firms responsible for the site to bear costs. Nonetheless, a listing may induce firms to clean up the sites voluntarily, or it may act as a potential trigger for subsequent enforcement or cost recovery actions. Such actions may impose costs on firms, but the decisions to take such actions are discretionary and made on a case-by-case basis. Consequently, precise estimates of these effects cannot be made. EPA does not believe that every site will be cleaned up by a responsible party. EPA cannot project at this time which firms or industry sectors will bear specific portions of response costs, but the Agency considers: the volume and nature of the wastes at the site, the parties' ability to pay, and other factors when deciding whether and how to proceed against potentially responsible parties.

Economy-wide effects of this proposed amendment are aggregations

of effects on firms and State and local governments. Although effects could be felt by some individual firms and States, the total impact of this revision on output, prices, and employment is expected to be negligible at the national level, as was the case in the 1982 RIA.

Benefits

The benefits associated with today's proposed amendment to list additional sites are increased health and environmental protection as a result of increased public awareness of potential hazards. In addition to the potential for more Federally-financed remedial actions, this proposed expansion of the NPL could accelerate privately-financed, voluntary cleanup efforts to avoid potential adverse publicity, private lawsuits, and/or Federal or State enforcement actions.

As a result of the additional NPL remedies, there will be lower human exposure to high-risk chemicals, and higher quality surface water, ground water, soil, and air. These benefits are expected to be significant, although difficult to estimate in advance of completing the RI/FS at these particular sites.

Associated with the costs of remedial actions are significant potential benefits and cost offsets. The distributional costs to firms of financing NPL remedies have corresponding "benefits" in that funds expended for a response generate employment, directly or indirectly (through purchased materials).

VII. Regulatory Flexibility Act Analysis

The Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 requires EPA to review the impacts of this action on small entities, or certify that the action will not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities. By small entities the Act refers to small businesses, small governmental jurisdictions, and nonprofit organizations.

While proposed modifications to the NPL are considered revisions to the NCP, they are not typical regulatory changes since the revisions do not automatically impose costs. The proposed listing of sites on the NPL does not in itself require any action of any private party, nor does it determine the liability of any party for the cost of cleanup at the site. Further, no identifiable groups are affected as a whole. As a consequence, it is hard to predict impacts on any group. A site's proposed inclusion on the NPL could increase the likelihood that adverse impacts to responsible parties (in the form of cleanup costs) will occur, but EPA cannot identify the potentially affected businesses at this time nor estimate the number of small businesses that might be affected.

The Agency does expect that certain industries and firms within industries that have caused a proportionately high percentage of waste site problems could be significantly affected by CERCLA actions. However, EPA does not expect the impacts from the proposed listing of these 45 sites to have a significant

economic impact on a substantial number of small businesses.

In any case, economic impacts would only occur through enforcement and cost recovery actions, which are taken at EPA's discretion on a site-by-site basis. EPA considers many factors when determining what enforcement actions to take, including not only the firm's contribution to the problem, but also the firm's ability to pay. The impacts from cost recovery on small governments and nonprofit organizations would be determined on a similar case-by-case basis.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 300

Air pollution control, Chemicals, Hazardous materials, Intergovernmental relations, Natural resources, Oil pollution, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Superfund, Waste treatment and disposal, Water pollution control, Water supply.

Part 300—[Amended]

It is proposed to amend 40 CFR Part 300 as follows:

1. The authority citation for Part 300 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 9605(a)(1)(B)/CERCLA 105(a)(1)(B).

2. It is proposed to add the following sites to Appendix B of Part 300.

Dated: May 19, 1986.

Jack W. McGraw,
Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of
Solid Waste and Emergency Response.

BILLING CODE 5560-50-M

NATIONAL PRIORITIES LIST PROPOSED UPDATE 5 SITES

| NPL RANK | EPA RC | ST | SITE NAME | CITY/COUNTY | RESPONSE CATEGORY# | CLEANUP STATUS@ |
|-------------|-----------|----|-----------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| GROUP 4 | | | | | | |
| 09 | AZ | | Apache Powder Co. | Benson | | D |
| 03 | PA | | Butler Mine Tunnel | Pittston | R | O |
| 05 | MI | | American Anodco, Inc. | Ionia | | D |
| GROUP 5 | | | | | | |
| 05 | WI | | Tomah Municipal Sanitary Landfill | Tomah | | D |
| GROUP 6 | | | | | | |
| 10 | WA | | Hidden Valley Lf (Thun Field) | Pierce County | | D |
| 09 | AZ | | Hassayampa Landfill | Hassayampa | | D |
| 05 | IL | | Tri-County Lf/Waste Mgmt | Illinois South Elgin | | D |
| GROUP 7 | | | | | | |
| 05 | IN | | Douglass Road/Uniroyal, Inc., Lf | Mishawaka | | D |
| 04 | SC | | Rochester Property | Travelers Rest | | D |
| 03 | PA | | Delta Quarries/Stotler Landfill | Antis/Logan Twps | | D |
| 01 | CT | | Revere Textile Prints Corp. | Sterling | | D |
| 03 | VA | | Atlantic Wood Industries, Inc. | Portsmouth | | D |
| GROUP 8 | | | | | | |
| 05 | WI | | Algoma Municipal Landfill | Algoma | | D |
| 04 | FL | | Sydney Mine Sludge Ponds | Brandon | | D O |

#: V = VOLUNTARY OR NEGOTIATED RESPONSE; R = FEDERAL AND STATE RESPONSE;
 F = FEDERAL ENFORCEMENT; S = STATE ENFORCEMENT;
 D = ACTIONS TO BE DETERMINED.

@: I = IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITY UNDERWAY, ONE OR MORE OPERABLE UNITS;
 O = ONE OR MORE OPERABLE UNITS COMPLETED, OTHERS MAY BE UNDERWAY;
 C = IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITY COMPLETED FOR ALL OPERABLE UNITS.

NATIONAL PRIORITIES LIST PROPOSED UPDATE 5 SITES

| NPL EPA RANK RC | ST SITE NAME | CITY/COUNTY | RESPONSE CATEGORY# | CLEANUP STATUS@ |
|--------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| GROUP 9 | | | | |
| 05 | OH TRW, Inc. (Minerva Plant) | Minerva | V | S I |
| 03 | PA Bally Ground Water Contamination | Bally Borough | | D |
| 05 | MN LaGrand Sanitary Landfill | LaGrand Township | S | |
| 05 | MI J & L Landfill | Rochester Hills | | D |
| 04 | KY Howe Valley Landfill | Howe Valley | | D |
| GROUP 10 | | | | |
| 02 | NY BioClinical Laboratories, Inc. | Bohemia | | D |
| 05 | IN Southside Sanitary Landfill | Indianapolis | V | S |
| GROUP 11 | | | | |
| 02 | NY Richardson Hill Road Lndfil/Pond | Sidney Center | | D |
| 08 | UT Midvale Slag | Midvale | | D |
| 09 | CA Waste Disposal, Inc. | Santa Fe Springs | | D |
| 07 | IA Red Oak City Landfill | Red Oak | | D |
| 04 | NC Cape Fear Wood Preserving | Fayetteville | R | O |
| 02 | NY Conklin Dumps | Conklin | | D |
| 06 | LA Combustion, Inc. | Denham Springs | S | |
| 02 | NY Genzale Plating Co. | Franklin Square | | D |
| GROUP 12 | | | | |
| 02 | NY Malta Rocket Fuel Area | Malta | | D |
| 09 | AZ Mesa Area Ground Water Contamin | Mesa | | D |
| 05 | MI Folkertsma Refuse | Grand Rapids | | D |
| 08 | MT Montana Pole and Treating | Butte | R | I |

#: V = VOLUNTARY OR NEGOTIATED RESPONSE; R = FEDERAL AND STATE RESPONSE;
 F = FEDERAL ENFORCEMENT; S = STATE ENFORCEMENT;
 D = ACTIONS TO BE DETERMINED.

@: I = IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITY UNDERWAY, ONE OR MORE OPERABLE UNITS;
 O = ONE OR MORE OPERABLE UNITS COMPLETED, OTHERS MAY BE UNDERWAY;
 C = IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITY COMPLETED FOR ALL OPERABLE UNITS.

NATIONAL PRIORITIES LIST PROPOSED UPDATE 5 SITES

| NPL RANK | EPA RG | ST | SITE NAME | CITY/COUNTY | RESPONSE CATEGORY# | CLEANUP STATUS@ |
|-------------|-----------|----|-----------|-------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
|-------------|-----------|----|-----------|-------------|-----------------------|--------------------|

GROUP 13

| | | | | | | |
|----|----|--|-----------------------------------|---------------------|---|---|
| 03 | PA | | Hebelka Auto Salvage Yard | Weisenberg Township | | D |
| 02 | NY | | Rowe Industries Ground Water Cont | Noyack/Sag Harbor | R | O |
| 04 | SC | | Medley Farm Drum Dump | Gaffney | R | O |
| 04 | FL | | Piper Aircraft/Vero Beach Wtr&Swr | Vero Beach | | D |
| 03 | PA | | Eastern Diversified Metals | Hometown | V | S |
| 05 | WI | | Hunts Disposal Landfill | Caledonia | | D |
| 06 | TX | | Sheridan Disposal Services | Hempstead | | D |

GROUP 14

| | | | | | | |
|----|----|--|-------------------------|---------|--|---|
| 03 | DE | | Tyler Refrigeration Pit | Smyrna | | D |
| 10 | WA | | Old Inland Pit | Spokane | | D |

GROUP 15

| | | | | | | |
|----|----|--|----------------|--------|--|---|
| 03 | PA | | CryoChem, Inc. | Worman | | D |
|----|----|--|----------------|--------|--|---|

NUMBER OF SITES PROPOSED FOR LISTING: 43

NATIONAL PRIORITIES LIST PROPOSED FEDERAL UPDATE 5 SITES

| NPL RANK | EPA RG | ST | SITE NAME | CITY/COUNTY | RESPONSE CATEGORY# | CLEANUP STATUS@ |
|-------------|-----------|----|-----------|-------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
|-------------|-----------|----|-----------|-------------|-----------------------|--------------------|

GROUP 2

| | | | | | | |
|----|----|--|-----------------------------------|---------------------|---|--|
| 03 | PA | | Naval Air Develop Center(8 Areas) | Warminster Township | R | |
|----|----|--|-----------------------------------|---------------------|---|--|

GROUP 12

| | | | | | | |
|----|----|--|----------------------------------|---------|---|--|
| 10 | WA | | Nav Undersea Warf Stat (4 Areas) | Keyport | R | |
|----|----|--|----------------------------------|---------|---|--|

#: V = VOLUNTARY OR NEGOTIATED RESPONSE; R = FEDERAL AND STATE RESPONSE;
F = FEDERAL ENFORCEMENT; S = STATE ENFORCEMENT;
D = ACTIONS TO BE DETERMINED.

@: I = IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITY UNDERWAY, ONE OR MORE OPERABLE UNITS;
O = ONE OR MORE OPERABLE UNITS COMPLETED, OTHERS MAY BE UNDERWAY;
C = IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITY COMPLETED FOR ALL OPERABLE UNITS.

NUMBER OF SITES PROPOSED FOR LISTING: 2

[FR Doc. 86-12004 Filed 6-9-86; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-C